



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY




AH 4TEB 5

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

912.1
Neander

THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
IN
CAMBRIDGE.





THE
BIBLICAL CABINET;
OR
HERMENEUTICAL, EXEGETICAL,
AND
PHILOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

VOL. XXXV.

NEANDER'S HISTORY OF THE FIRST PLANTING OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

EDINBURGH:
THOMAS CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET;
HAMILTON, ADAMS & CO. LONDON; W. CURRY JUN. & CO. DUBLIN;
W. R. PETERS, 36 PARK ROW, NEW YORK; AND
WHIPPLE & DAMRELL, BOSTON.

MDCCCXLII.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY J. GREIG, LAWNMARKET.


HISTORY
OF THE
PLANTING AND TRAINING
OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH
BY THE
APOSTLES.

Johann BY *Nikolaus*
DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER,
ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF
BERLIN, CONSISTORIAL COUNSELLOR, &c.

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD EDITION OF THE ORIGINAL GERMAN,

BY
J. E. RYLAND.

VOL. I.



EDINBURGH:
THOMAS CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCXLII.

Philosophia quærit, religio possidet veritatem.

J. PICUS A MIRANDOLA.

Kein andrer Gott als der Gott der Bible, der Herz zu Herz ist.

NIEBUHR.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

ONLY a few words seem necessary by way of preface to the following translation. It was begun towards the close of 1840; but early in the present year the Translator having requested Dr Neander to favour him with any corrections or additions which he might have made to the second edition (published in 1838), was informed, in reply, that a third edition was passing through the press: at the same time, an offer was most kindly made of forwarding the proof-sheets, by which means the translation will appear within a few weeks after the original, in its most approved form.

It may be proper to state, that there were circumstances which rendered it desirable that as little delay as possible should occur in the preparation of the English work. This demand for expedition may have perhaps occasioned more inadvertencies than the modicum of negative reputation allotted to literary workmanship of this kind can well afford. The Translator trusts, however, that he has, on the whole, succeeded in giving a tolerably correct representation of the original, though, had time been allowed for a more careful revision, several minor blemishes might have been removed, and the meaning of some passages have been more distinctly brought out.

The Author's great and long-established reputation as an Ecclesiastical Historian, would render it unnecessary,

even if not somewhat unseemly, to usher in this work with a lengthened descant on its merits. The impartial and earnest inquirer after truth, will not fail to be delighted with the marks it everywhere presents of unwearied research, extended views, and profound piety. No one would regret more than the excellent author, if the freedom of his inquiries should give pain to any of his Christian brethren; still his motto must be "*Amicus Socrates, magis amica Veritas.*" He is completely at issue with the advocates of certain views which have lately been gaining a disastrous prevalence in this country. The decided terms in which he asserts the noble equality and brotherhood of Christian men, in opposition to the anti-christian tenet of a priesthood in the sense not of religious instructors, but of exclusive conveyers of supernatural influence,* will be little relished by those who would attempt to share the incommunicable prerogatives of the "one Mediator." But, as Dr N. justly remarks in one of his earlier communications (for all of which the Translator is glad of an opportunity to express his heartfelt gratitude), "the gospel itself rests on an immoveable rock, while human systems of theology are everywhere undergoing a purifying process, 1 Cor. iii. 12, 13. WE LIVE IN THE TIME OF A GREAT CRISIS!"

* By no writers has this error been more ably exposed than by Archbishop Whately and Dr Arnold; by the former, in "the Errors of Romanism traced to their origin in human nature," and by the latter, in the introduction to a volume of discourses, lately published on "the Christian Life."—"To revive Christ's church is to expel the antichrist of priesthood, which, as it was foretold of him, '*as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God;*' and to restore its disfranchised members, the laity, to the discharge of their proper duties in it, and to the consciousness of their paramount importance," p. 52.

This translation has been prepared at a distance from those helps which would have been within my reach at an earlier period, and soon after a change of residence had separated me from three friends especially, with whom most of the important topics in these volumes had been submitted to frequent and earnest discussion. Without the formality of a dedication, my sense of the value of their friendship prompts me to make this allusion, which is connected with some of my most pleasing recollections. I wish also to express my obligations to Dr Edward Michelson of the University of Leipzig, who not only gave up his intention of publishing a translation of this work, on being informed that I was engaged in a similar undertaking, but most readily favoured me with his opinion on various passages during the preparation of the manuscript. I have received, too, from a friend of Dr Neander, with whose name I am not acquainted, the results of a very careful examination of the first six proof-sheets, which I gratefully acknowledge, and only regret that the whole work could not be submitted to his review previous to publication.

A brief biographical notice of Dr Neander, extracted from the "*Conversations-Lexicon*," will probably not be unacceptable to the readers of this work.

J. E. R.

NORTHAMPTON, *November 2. 1841.*

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE.

JOHN AUGUSTUS WILLIAM NEANDER, Ordinary Professor of Theology at Berlin, Consistorial Counsellor in the Royal Consistorium of the Province of Brandenburg, was born at Gottingen, January 16. 1789, and spent the greater part of his youth at Hamburg. In that city he received his education at the Gymnasium and Johanneum, which then flourished under Grulitt's superintendence. He began his academical studies at Halle in 1806, shortly after having renounced the Jewish faith and embraced Christianity, and ended them in Gottingen under the venerable Planck. After a short residence in Hamburg, he removed in 1811 to Heidelberg, and there commenced as a theological teacher, by defending his essay, "*De fidei gnoseosque ideæ qua ad se invicem atque ad philosophiam referatur, ratione, secundum mentem Clementis Alexandri.*" In the following year he became extraordinary professor of Theology in Heidelberg. He then published a work replete with a living freshness of delineation and spirited discussion, "*Über den Kaiser Julianus und sein Zeitalter,*" which shewed the hand of a master in this department of Church history, and marked an extraordinary progress in his power of thought and reflection. In the following year he received a call to the university of Berlin. His second Monograph, "*Der heilige Bernard und sein Zeitalter,*" (1813), was enlarged in the last edi-

tion by an introduction on the first period of the scholastic philosophy. Neander then turned his attention to the early period of the church, and produced a work on Gnosticism, "*Genetische Entwicklung der vornehmsten gnostischen Systems*," (1818). He delineated, with a special reference to life and practice, the character of a bishop who was distinguished as a preacher, pastor, and theological writer, in a work entitled, "*Der heilige Chrysostomus und die Kirche, besonders des Orients, in dessen Zeitalter*." The third volume of this work is designed to embrace the peculiar theological views of Chrysostom. Neander intended to leave the biography of Augustin to a friend, but we would rather hope, that we may receive it from himself, the creator and master of the new Patristic monographs, as he has opened the way to it by his work on Tertullian, "*Antignostikus Geist der Tertullianus*," (1825). In his "*Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christenthums und des christlichen lebens*," 3 vols., Berlin 1822, 2d edit. 1825, (since translated into French), he has attempted the difficult task of imparting to general readers the substance of what is most important and interesting to that class in his Church History. This work unfortunately reaches only to the times of Anschar.* All the works we have hitherto mentioned were only preparative to his "*General History of the Christian Religion and Church*," of which the design may be expressed most simply and clearly in the Author's own words. He states, that it had been from early life the object of his studies to exhibit Church His-

* Anschar or Ansgar, a French monk born at Corbie, in the diocese of Amiens, in the year 801. An interesting account of his labours in the North of Europe, is given by Dr Neander in the 4th vol. of his "*Allgemeine Geschichte*," pp. 3-33. [Tr.]

tory as a speaking evidence of the divine power of Christianity—as a school of Christian experience—a voice of edification, instruction, and warning, sounding through all ages for all who are willing to listen to it. The first volume, in three parts, contains the history of the church from the end of the Apostolic age to the year 311;* the second volume, also in three parts, reaches to Gregory I.; the third volume appeared in 1831, the fourth appeared in 1836, and the fifth has been published during the present year 1841, bringing down the history to the year 1294.

The work of which a translation is now given first appeared in 1832. A collection of his smaller writings, including an address at the formation of the Berlin Bible Society, was published in 1829.

Dr Neander's lectures in the University extend to all branches of historical theology, to the exegesis of most of the New Testament writings, to which he has added lectures on Systematic Theology. His labours in the Consistorium relate principally to theological examinations. With an infirm state of health, he devotes all the time which his onerous official duties and literary avocations leave at his command to intercourse with the students of theology. What he has done and is still doing in this respect—his devotion to the benefit of the young, cannot and need not be enlarged upon here. There are living attestations in abundance.

* Of this an English translation has lately appeared, in 2 vols. 8vo, by the Rev. H. J. Rose.—Tr.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

DR F. EHRENBERG,

ROYAL CHAPLAIN, MEMBER OF THE SUPREME CONSISTORY,

&c. &c.

MY DEEPLY REVERED AND VERY DEAR FRIEND,

I trust you will receive this work with all its defects as the offering of a sincere heart ; as a small token of my cordial veneration and love, and of that sincere gratitude which I have long felt impelled to express, for the edification I have derived from your discourses. May a gracious God long allow you to labour and shine among us for the welfare of his church, with that holy energy which he has bestowed upon you, with the spirit of Christian wisdom and freedom, the spirit of true freedom exalted above all the strife of human parties,—which the Son of God alone bestows, and which is especially requisite for the guidance of the church in our times, agitated and distracted as they are by so many conflicts ! This is the warmest wish of one who with all his heart calls himself yours.

Thus I wrote on the 22d of May 1832, and after six years I again repeat with all my heart, the words expressive of dedication, of gratitude, and of devout wishes to the Giver of all perfect gifts. Since that portion of time (not unimportant in our agitated age) has passed away, I have to

thank you, dear and inmosty revered Man, for many important words of edification and instruction, which I have received from your lips in public, as well as for the precious gift * which has often administered refreshment to myself and others. Yes, with all my heart I agree with those beautiful sentiments which form the soul of your discourses, and bind me with such force to your person. God grant that we may ever humbly and faithfully hold fast the truth which does not seek for reconciliation amidst contrarieties, but is itself unsought the right mean. God grant (what is far above all theological disputations,) that the highest aim of our labours may be to produce the image of Christ in the souls of men,—that to our latest breath we may keep this object in view without wavering, fast bound to it in true love, each one in his own sphere, unmoved by the vicissitudes of opinion and the collisions of party !

Let me add as a subordinate wish, that you would soon favour us with a volume of discourses, to testify of this “one thing that is needful.”

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, 30th May 1838.

From the fulness of my heart I once more repeat the wishes and thanks before expressed, and rejoice that it is in my power to dedicate the third edition of this work to you, my inmosty dear and revered friend.

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, 2d August 1841.

* Alluding probably to a volume of Sermons already published.—Tz.

PREFACE

TO


VOL. I. OF THE FIRST EDITION.

It was certainly my intention to have allowed my representation of the Christian religion and church in the apostolic age, to follow the completion of the whole of my Church History, or at least of the greater part of it; but the wishes and entreaties of many persons, expressed both in writing and by word of mouth, have prevailed upon me to alter my plan. Those, too, who took an interest in my mode of conceiving the development of Christianity, were justified in demanding an account of the manner in which I conceived the origin of this process, on which the opinions of men are so much divided through the conflicting influences of the various theological tendencies in this critical period of our German Evangelical church; and perhaps, if it please God, a thoroughly matured and candidly expressed conviction on the subjects here discussed, may furnish many a one who is engaged in seeking, with a connecting link for the comprehension of his own views, even if this representation, though the result

of protracted and earnest inquiry, should contain no new disclosures.

As for my relation to all who hold the conviction, that faith in Jesus the Saviour of sinful humanity, as it has shewn itself since the first founding of the Christian church to be the fountain of divine life, will prove itself the same to the end of time, and that from this faith a new creation will arise in the Christian church and in our part of the world, which has been preparing amidst the storms of spring—to all such persons I hope to be bound by the bond of Christian fellowship, the bond of “*the true Catholic spirit*,” as it is termed by an excellent English theologian of the 17th century.* But I cannot agree with the conviction of those among them who think that this new creation will be only a repetition of

* We meet with a beautiful specimen of such a spirit in what has been admirably said by a respected theologian of the Society of Friends, Joseph John Gurney: “It can scarcely be denied, that in that variety of administration, through which the saving principles of religion are for the present permitted to pass, *there is much of a real adaptation to a corresponding variety of mental condition*. Well, therefore, may we bow with thankfulness before that infinite and unsearchable Being, who in all our weakness follows us with his love, and through the diversified mediums of religion to which the several classes of *true* Christians are respectively accustomed, is still pleased to reveal to them all *the same* crucified Redeemer, and to direct their footsteps into one path of obedience, holiness and peace.” See *Observations on the distinguishing Views and Practices of the Society of Friends*, by Joseph John Gurney, ed. vii. London, 1834. Words fit to shame theologians who are burning with zeal for the letter and forms, as if on these depended the essence of religion, whose life and spirit are rooted in facts.



what took place in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and that the whole dogmatic system, and the entire mode of contemplating divine and human things,* must return as it then existed.

. On this point, I assent with my whole soul to what my deeply revered and beloved friend, Steudel, lately expressed, so deserving of consideration in our times, and especially to be commended to the attention of our young theologians.† He admirably remarks, "But exactly this and only this, is the pre-eminence of the one truth, that it maintains its triumphant worth under all changes of form;" and Niebuhr detected in the eagerness to restore the old, an eagerness for novelty; "When the novelty of

* Well might the noble words of Luther be applied to those who cling to the old rotten posts of a scaffolding raised by human hands, as if they were needed for the divine building. "When at a window I have gazed on the stars of heaven, and the whole beautiful vault of heaven, and saw no pillars on which the builder had set such a vault; yet the heavens fell not in; and that vault still stands firm. Now there are simple folk who look about for such pillars and would fain grasp and feel them. But since they cannot do this, they quake and tremble, as if the heavens would certainly fall in, and for no other reason than because they cannot grasp or see the pillars; if they could but lay hold of them, then the heavens (they think) would stand firm enough."

† In the Tübingen "*Zeitschrift für Theologie*," 1832, part i. p. 33. Blessed be the memory of this beloved man, who left this world a few months ago, and is no longer to be seen in the holy band of combatants for that evangelical truth which was the aim, the centre, and the soul of his whole life, and the firm anchor of his hope in death, when he proved himself to be one of those faithful teachers of whom it may be said—"whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation."

a thing is worn away by use, we are prone to return to the old, which then becomes new again, and thus the ball is thrown backwards and forwards."*

In truth, whatever is connected with the peculiarities of the forms of human cultivation, as these change, goes the way of all flesh; but the Word of God, which is destined by a perpetual youthfulness of power to make all things new—abides for ever. Thus the difference existing between these persons and myself, will certainly shew itself in our conception of many important points in this department of history, but in my judgment these differences are only scientific, and ought not to disturb that fellowship which is above all science. But I can also transport myself to the standing-point of those to whom these objects must appear in a different light; for the rise of such differences is in this critical period unavoidable, and far better than the previous indifference and lifeless uniformity. And even in zeal for a definite form, I know how to esteem and to love a zeal for the essence which lies at the bottom,† and I can never have any thing in common with those who will not do justice to such zeal, or,

* One of the many golden sentences of this great man in his letters, of which we would recommend the second volume especially to all young theologians.

† Provided it be the true zeal of simplicity, which accompanies humility, and where sagacity does not predominate over simplicity; but by no means that zeal which, in coupling itself with the modern coxcombry of a super-refined education, endeavours to season subjects with it to which it is least adapted, in order to render them palatable to the vitiated taste that loathes a simple diet; and thus proves its own unsoundness. A caricature jumble of the most contradictory elements at which every sound feeling must revolt!

instead of treating it with the respect that is always due to zeal and affection for what is holy, with Jesuitical craft aim at rendering others suspected, by imputing to them sinister motives and designs.

It was not my intention to give a complete history of the Apostolic age, but only what the title, advisedly selected, indicates. I have prefixed to it the Introduction from the first volume of my Church History, reserving the recasting of the whole work for a new edition, should God permit.

In reference to the arrangement of the whole plan and the mutual relation of the parts of the representation, I must beg the reader to suspend his judgment awhile, till the completion of the whole by the publication of the second part.

It will be my constant aim to carry on to its conclusion the whole of the work I have undertaken on the history of the Church, if God continue to grant me strength and resolution for the purpose. Meanwhile, a brief compendium of Church History on the principles of my arrangement, but enriched with literary notices, will be published. My dear friend Professor Rheinwald of Bonn having been prevented by his new duties from executing this work, it has been undertaken at my request by another of my friends, Mr Licentiate Vogt,* already favourably known to the theological public by his share in editing the Homiliarium, and still more commended to the public favour by his literary labours on the Pseudo-Dionysius, and the Life and Times of Gerson, Chancellor of Paris. May he receive from every quarter that public

* Now Dr Vogt, ordinary professor of Theology, and pastor at Greifswald.

favour and encouragement which his character, acquirements, and performances deserve.*

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, 29th May 1832.

* This wish for so peculiarly dear a friend, whose personal intercourse, so beneficial to my heart, I no longer enjoy, has been fulfilled. But his multiplied labours will not permit him to accomplish the design mentioned above. Yet if it please God, another of my young friends will be found fitted for the task.

PREFACE

TO

VOL. II. OF THE FIRST EDITION.

I HAVE only a few words to say in addition to the Preface of the first volume. The exposition of doctrines which occupies the principal part of the second half of this work, I was obliged to regulate as to quantity by the relation in which this work stands to the general history of the Church, and the proportion which the history of doctrine in the latter bears to the whole. Hence I have been obliged to leave untouched many questions which would occur to the Christian theologian, who develops and elaborates the contents of the sacred records for the use of his own times; my endeavours have been confined to representing primitive Christianity according to its principal models of doctrine in its historical development. In executing such a work, every man must be influenced by his own religious and doctrinal standing-point, by his views of the doctrines of Christianity, its origin, and its relation to the general development of the human race. On this point no one can blame another for differing from himself; for a purely objective historical work, stripped of all subjectivity in its representation, untinctured

by the individual notions of the writer, is an absurdity. The only question is, what point of view in the contemplation of these objects most nearly corresponds to the truth, and from this the clearest conceptions will be formed of the images presented in history. Without renouncing our subjectivity, without giving up our own way of thinking (a thing utterly impossible) to those of others, or rendering it a slave to the dogmas of any school which the petty arrogance of man would set on the throne of the living God, (for this would be to forfeit the divine freedom won for us by Christ,) our efforts must be directed to the constant purification and elevation of our thinking (otherwise subject to sin and error) by the spirit of truth. Free enquiry belongs to the goods of humanity, but it presupposes the *true* freedom of the whole man, which commences in the disposition, which has its seat in the heart, and we know where this freedom is alone to be found. We know, whence that freedom came which by means of Luther and the Reformation broke the fetters of the human mind. We know that those who have this beautiful name most frequently on their lips, often mean by it only another kind of slavery.

It will now be my most earnest care and greatest satisfaction, to devote the time and strength not employed in my official labours, to the continuation of my History of the Church to its termination, for which may God grant me the assistance of his Spirit!

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, 9th August 1832.



(GENERAL) PREFACE

TO

THE SECOND EDITION.

HAVING, as I believe, sufficiently explained in my former prefaces, the object of this work and the theological position it takes in relation to other standing-points, I have little more to add. What I have here expressed will serve to rectify several errors which have since been discovered, and to pacify, as far as possible, various complaints. Many things indeed find their rectification or settlement only in that constant process of development and purification which is going on in a critical age. There is a fire kindled which must separate in the building that is founded on a rock, the wood, hay and stubble, from what is formed of the precious metals and jewels. There are imaginary wants which not only I cannot satisfy, but which I do not wish to satisfy. The activity shewn of late years, in Biblical inquiries and the kindred branches of history, has enabled me to correct and amplify many parts, and to vindicate others from objections.

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, 30th *May* 1838.

PREFACE

TO

THE THIRD EDITION.

As to what I have said respecting the position I have taken in reference to the controversies which are every day waxing fiercer, and distract an age that longs after a new creation, I can only reassert that, if it please God, I hope to abide faithful to these principles to my latest breath! the ground beneath our feet may be shaken, but not the heavens above us. We will adhere to that *theologia pectoris*, which is likewise the true theology of the spirit, the *German* theology as Luther calls it.

The demand for this new edition was a call to improve the work to the utmost of my ability, and to introduce whatever new views appeared to me to be correct.

Sound criticism on particular points will always be welcome to me; the cavils of self-important sciolists I shall always despise.

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, 2d August 1841.



CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN PALESTINE, PREVIOUS TO ITS SPREAD AMONG HEATHEN NATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ON ITS FIRST APPEARANCE AS A DISTINCT RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

Preparation for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Pages 1-3	
The outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost,	3-23
The gift of tongues,	8-19
Peter's discourse and its effects...his call to repentance, faith, and baptism,	21-23

CHAPTER II.

THE FIRST FORM OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY, AND THE FIRST GERM OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

The formation of a community...one article of faith... Baptism into Jesus as the Messiah...probably only one baptismal formula...imperfect knowledge and mixed character of the first converts,	24-25
The first form of the Christian community and worship...the Agapæ,	25

Community of goods...influence of Christianity on social relations...orders of monkhood—the St Simonians,	28-31
The case of Ananias and Sapphira,	31-33
Adherence to the Temple-worship,	33-34
The institution of Deacons,	35-40
The institution of Presbyters...originally for the purpose of government rather than of instruction,	41-42
Means of instruction...Teachers; <i>διδασκαλία, προφητεία, παρακλήσις,</i>	43-44
Gradual transition from Judaism to Christianity,	45-47

CHAPTER III.

THE OUTWARD CONDITION OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH ; PERSECUTIONS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES.

The cure of the impotent man...Peter and John brought before the Sanhedrim...the increase of believers... Peter's address...Gamaliel,	47-55
Christianity in direct conflict with Pharisaism...Stephen the forerunner of Paul...his views of Christianity in opposition to the permanence of the Mosaic ritual...his discourse before the Sanhedrim... Martyrdom, and its effects,	56-65

BOOK II.

THE FIRST SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY FROM THE CHURCH AT JERUSALEM TO OTHER PARTS, AND ESPECIALLY AMONG HEATHEN NATIONS.

Samaria...its religious state...the Goetæ...Simon...Philip's preaching and miracles...Simon's baptism...Peter and John sent to Samaria...Philip's labours in Ethiopia, &c.	66-74
--	-------

Formation of Gentile churches...enlarged views of the apostles produced by internal revelation and outward events,	75-76
Peter's labours at Lydia and Joppa...Cornelius the Centurion...a Proselyte of the Gate...his prayers and fasting...vision of an Angel...Peter's vision...his address to Cornelius—the gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed on the Gentile converts,	76-88

BOOK III.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AMONG THE GENTILES BY THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

CHAPTER I.

PAUL'S PREPARATION AND CALL TO BE THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES.

Paul's peculiar position in the development of the kingdom of God...his parentage and education...his strict legal piety...compared with Luther,	89-94
Paul a zealous persecutor of the Christians...his miraculous conversion...unsatisfactory explanation on natural principles...or considered as merely internal...a real appearance of the risen Saviour...its effects,	95-104
Paul preaches the Gospel at Damascus—goes into Arabia...return to Damascus...and flight...visit to Jerusalem...the peculiar development of his religious views...return to Tarsus,	105-114

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH AT ANTIOCH THE GENTILE MOTHER-CHURCH,
AND ITS RELATION TO THE JEWISH MOTHER-CHURCH.

Barnabas at Antioch...the name *Christians* first given to believers...contributions from the church at Antioch to the church at Jerusalem...Persecution by Herod Agrippa...Paul's visit to Jerusalem...whether the same as that mentioned in Galat. ii. 1...Barnabas and Paul sent from Antioch to preach among the Gentiles, 115-123

CHAPTER III.

THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY BY PAUL AND BARNABAS.

Their visit to Cyprus...conversion of the Proconsul Sergius Paulus...the Goës Barjesus...Antioch in Pisidia...Iconium...Lystra...cure of the lame man...the Apostles supposed to be Zeus and Hermes...the popular tumult...their return to Antioch, . . . 123-133

CHAPTER IV.

THE DIVISION BETWEEN THE JEWISH AND GENTILE CHRISTIANS
AND ITS SETTLEMENT...THE INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT
OF THE GENTILE CHURCH.

Dispute between the Jewish and Gentile Christians respecting circumcision...mission of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem...Paul's private conferences with the apostles...his apostleship acknowledged...his controversy with the Jewish believers and opposition to the circumcision of Titus, 133-136

<i>The Apostolic Convention...Peter's address...Barnabas and Paul give an account of their success among the Gentiles...proposal of James...the moderation and conciliatory spirit of Paul and James...epistle to the Gentile Christians in Syria and Cilicia...return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch...the important results of this convention,</i>	136-149
--	---------

CHAPTER V.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL
USAGES OF THE GENTILE CHRISTIANS.

The peculiar nature of the Christian community... all Christians priests...equally related to Christ... and in a relation of fraternal equality to one another,	149-151
The influence of the Holy Spirit on the varieties of mental character and natural endowments...the idea of charisms...the gifts of <i>divinatus, consilium, vigorem,</i>	152-154
1. Charisms or gifts for the ministry of the Word,	154-163
2. Charisms relating to the government of the church, <i>πρεσβυτεριον, επισκοπον</i> ...elders or presbyters and over- seers or bishops originally the same...exclusion of females from the office of public teaching,	164-171
Originally three orders of teachers...apostles, evange- lists, teachers,...relation of the last to elders and overseers,	172-178
The office of deaconesses,	179
Ordination...election to offices,	180-181
The Christian Worship...independence of the Mosaic ritual...hence no distinction of days...no Christian feasts mentioned by Paul,	182-183
The Christian Sabbath...its special reference to the re- surrection of Christ...no yearly commemoration of the resurrection,	184-186

Baptism...the formula...symbolic meaning of the act of submersion and emersion...infant-baptism probably not of apostolic origin...substitutionary baptism (note)...the influence of the parental relation on the offspring of Christians,	187-193
The Lord's Supper,	194
Advantages and Disadvantages of the Gentile Converts...preparation of mankind for a reception of the Gospel...by a sense of guilt and unhappiness...its direct contrariety to Heathenism...dangers from the corruption of morals...and from philosophical speculations,	194-196

CHAPTER VI.

SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

The separation of Paul and Barnabas on account of Mark...Paul and Silas visit Isauria and Pisidia...meet with Timothy...Phrygia...Galatia...Troas...Philippi...baptism of Lydia...persecution...conversion of the Philippian jailor,	196-208
Paul at Thessalonica...addresses both Jews and Gentiles...gains a livelihood by tent-making...his expectations of the near approach of the second coming of Christ...fanatical opposition of the Jews...proceeds to Berea,	208-216
Paul at Athens...the religious character of the Athenians...Paul disputes with the philosophers...the relation of the Stoics and Epicureans to Christianity,	217-219
Paul's discourse...his appeal to the religious principle implanted in human nature...the altar to an unknown God...Polytheism...the one living God...announcement of a Redeemer...the effect of his discourse...Dionysius the Areopagite...Timothy sent to Thessalonica,	220-228

Paul at Corinth...two chief obstacles to the reception of the Gospel...fondness for speculation...and for sensual indulgences...meets with Aquila and Priscilla...the Church formed principally of Gentile converts...the Proconsul Gallio...Paul's labours in Achaia,	229-235
Thessalonica...information of the state of the church brought by Timothy...the First Epistle to the Thessalonians...enthusiastic tendencies...a forged Epistle...the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians...the signs preceding the second coming of Christ...marks of a genuine epistle,	236-241

CHAPTER VII.

THE APOSTLE PAUL'S JOURNEY TO ANTIOCH, AND HIS RENEWED
MISSIONARY LABOURS AMONG THE HEATHEN.

Paul's journey to Jerusalem...his vow and offering in the Temple,	242-244
Paul at Antioch...his meeting with Barnabas and Peter...his reprimand of Peter...revival of the controversy between the Jewish and Gentile Christians,	245-249
Paul visits Phrygia and Galatia,	250
Paul at Ephesus...his labours first in the synagogue...then among the Gentiles...the Jewish Goetæ...the disciples of John the Baptist rebaptized,	251-255
State of the Galatian churches...Paul's Epistle to the Galatians written by his own hand...asserts his independent apostleship...states the relation of Christianity to Judaism and Heathenism...warns them against seeking for justification by the law...date of this epistle,	256-264
State of the church at Corinth...causes of its disorders; superficial conversion, general immorality, divisions occasioned by false teachers,	265-267
Parties in the Corinthian church...the Petrine...the Pauline...that of Apollos...that of Christ,	268-282
Disputes in the Corinthian church...meat offered in sacrifice to idols...Marriage and celibacy...litigation in	

heathen courts of justice...irregularities at the celebration of the Agapæ...overvaluation of extraordinary gifts...opposition to the doctrine of the Resurrection,	283-296
Paul's second visit to Corinth...his last Epistle to the Corinthians,	296-306
The First Epistle to the Corinthians...occasioned by certain questions proposed by the church, relative to the epistle not now extant...its contents...on parties...on meat offered to idols...on marriage and celibacy...on slavery...its date,	300-309
Paul's plans for his future labours...mission of Timothy to Macedonia and Achaia...return of Timothy...Titus sent to Corinth...popular commotion at Ephesus against Paul...Demetrius...Alexander...the Asiarchs...Paul leaves Ephesus,	310-321
Paul in Macedonia...Titus brings information respecting the church at Corinth...the Second Epistle to the Corinthians,	321-326
Paul in Illyria...in Achaia...his intention of visiting Rome...his epistle to the Romans...sent by the deaconess Phœbe...state of the church at Rome...contents of the epistle,	327-345

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIFTH AND LAST JOURNEY OF PAUL TO JERUSALEM...ITS IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES...HIS IMPRISONMENT IN PALESTINE.

Paul at Philippi...meets the overseers of the Ephesian church at Miletus...his farewell address,	345-352
Paul's journey to Jerusalem...his conference with James and the elders of the church...his Nazarite's vow...the rage of the Jews...his rescue by the Roman tribune...his appearance before the Sanhedrim,	352-361
Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea...his appearance before Felix...appeals to Cæsar...address to King Agrippa...sent to Rome...duration of his confinement,	361-367

CHAPTER IX.

PAUL DURING HIS FIRST CONFINEMENT AT ROME, AND THE
DEVELOPMENT DURING THAT PERIOD OF THE CHURCHES
FOUNDED BY HIM.

Paul's relation to the Roman state...to the church at Rome...and to other churches...his care of the Asiatic churches...date of the Epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon...Epaphras his fellow-prisoner,	368-374
False teachers at Colosse...peculiarities of the party...the germ of Judaizing Gnosticism...allied to the sect of Cerinthus...Paul's Epistle to the Colossians,	374-385
Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians...sent by Tychicus...a general epistle to the churches in Lesser Asia,	386
Paul's Epistle to the Philippians,	387

CHAPTER X.

PAUL'S LABOURS AFTER HIS RELEASE FROM HIS FIRST
CONFINEMENT AT ROME TO HIS MARTYRDOM.

Evidence of Paul's release from his first confinement at Rome...testimony of Clemens of Rome...the Second Epistle to Timothy...causes of the Neronian persecution,	388-395
Paul's labours after his release...in Ephesus...in Macedonia...the First Epistle to Timothy...Paul in Crete...the Epistle to Titus...Paul in Nicopolis...in Spain...his second imprisonment...the Second Epistle to Timothy...the date of his martyrdom...the Epistle to the Hebrews written by an apostolic man of the Pauline school,	396-408

ERRATA IN VOL. I.

- Page 9, line 1 (Note), for It may be asked, read The question is,
 ... 61, ... 6 (Note), for relinquish, read discharge,
 ... 67, ... 21, for intelligence read intelligences
 ... 74, ... 3, for various read vicious
 ... 74, ... 14, for the theosophic read the later theosophic
 ... 74, ... 16, omit later before Oriental,
 ... 80, ... 8 (Note), for from the fourth day I fasted to the ninth hour,
 read I fasted to the ninth hour of the fourth day,
 ... 81, ... 9, 10 (Note), for the third hour read three o'clock
 ... 87, ... 17 (Note), for faith read doctrine
 ... 111, ... 6 (Note †), for Judaisms read Judaizers
 ... 122, ... 3, for disciplinship read discipleship
 ... 127, ... 15 (Note), for ἀμαρτίαν read ἀμαρτίαν
 ... 132, ... 29, for where read were
 ... 144, ... 9, 10 (Note), for reported read supported
 ... 154, ... 16, for ἰαματῶν read ἰαματῶν
 ... 159, ... 1, for formed peculiar read formed a peculiar
 ... 205, ... 3 (Note †), for Udar, read War,
 ... 213, ... 23, for all-subaiding read all-subduing
 ... 213, ... 31, for the read his
 ... 217, ... 7, for fought read fraught
 ... 324, ... 1 (Note), for contained read containing
 ... 233, ... 9, for removed read remove
 ... 235, ... 9, for institution read institutions
 ... 235, ... 11, for propagations read propagation
 ... 269, ... 5 (Note), for λαγίαι read λαγίαι
 ... 289, ... 5, for he at once read he had at once
 ... 346, ... 30 (Note), for generic read generic term
 ... 359, ... 14, for Ars read Arz
 ... 398, ... 2 (Note), for reason read reasons

ERRATA IN VOL. II.

- Page 12, line 11, for the read this
 ... 39, ... 8, for Claudian read Claudius
 ... 44, ... 14, for repose read silent
 ... 57, ... 16, for as if the words are read or the words may be
 ... 58, ... 22, for man read men
 ... 61, ... 11, for gave read give
 ... 59, ... 16, for sinfulness read sinlessness
 ... 95, ... 10 (from bottom), for than read from
 ... 127, ... 6, for privileges with read privileges connected with
 ... 154, ... 5, for in read is
 ... 158, ... 18 (Note), for invade read invide
 ... 172, ... 2 (Note), for duplices read duplicit
 ... 185, ... 6, for re-existence read pre-existence
 ... 214, ... 36, for had not attained read would not have attained
 ... 214, ... 37, after this add generation
 ... 239, ... 4 (from bottom), for he does, like read he does not, like
 ... 261, ... 4 (from bottom), for resolution read realization

BOOK I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN PALESTINE, PREVIOUS TO ITS SPREAD AMONG HEATHEN NATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ON ITS FIRST APPEARANCE AS A DISTINCT RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

THE historical development of the Christian Church as a body, is similar to that of the Christian life in each of its members. In the latter case, the transition from an unchristian to a christian state is not an event altogether sudden, and without any preparatory steps. Many separate rays of divine light, at different times, enter the soul; various influences of awakening preparative grace are felt, before the birth of that new divine life by which the whole character of man is destined to be taken possession of, pervaded, and transformed. The appearance of a new personality sanctified by the divine principle of life, necessarily forms a great era in life, but the commencement of this era is not marked with perfect precision and distinctness; the new creation manifests itself more or less gradually by its effects. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth." The same may be affirmed of the church collectively, with this difference however, that here the point of commencement is more visibly and decidedly marked.

It is true, that Christ, during his ministry on earth, laid the foundation of the outward structure of the church; he then formed that community, that spiritual

theocracy, whose members were held together by faith in him, and a profession of allegiance to him as their King; and which was the chosen vessel for receiving and conveying to all the tribes of the earth that divine indwelling life, which he came to impart to the whole human race. The fountain of divine life was still shut up in him, and had not diffused itself abroad with that energy and peculiarity of direction, which were essential to the formation of the Christian church. The apostles themselves were as yet confined to the bodily presence and outward guidance of the Redeemer: though, by the operation of Christ, the seminal principle of a divine life had been deposited in their hearts, and given signs of germination, still it had not attained its full expansion and peculiar character; hence it might be affirmed, that what constituted the animating spirit and the essential nature of the Christian church, as an association gradually enlarging itself—(the unity of a divine life manifesting itself in a variety of individual peculiarities) had not yet appeared; this event, indeed, Christ had intimated would not take place till preparation had been made for it by his sufferings and return to his heavenly Father.

At his last interview with the disciples, just before his final separation from them, in answer to their inquiry respecting the coming of his kingdom, he referred them to the power of the Holy Spirit, who would enable them rightly to understand the doctrine of his kingdom, and furnish them with fit instruments for spreading it through the world. All the promises of the Saviour relate, it is true, not merely to one single event, but to the whole of the influence of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles, and in a certain sense, on the Universal Church founded by their means; yet the display of that influence for the first time, forms so distinguished an epoch in the lives of the Apostles, that it may properly be considered as an especial fulfilment of these promises. Christ pointed out to the Apostles such a palpable epoch, which would be attended with a firm conviction of a great internal operation on their minds, an unwavering consciousness

of the illumination imparted by the Divine Spirit; for, before his final departure, he enjoined upon them, not to leave Jerusalem till that promise was fulfilled, and they had received that baptism of the Spirit which would shortly take place.

On account of this event, the Pentecost which the disciples celebrated soon after the Saviour's departure, is of such great importance, as marking the commencement of the Apostolic Church, for here it first publicly displayed its essential character. Next to the appearance of the Son of God himself on earth, this* was the greatest event, as the commencing point of the new divine life, proceeding from him to the human race, which has since spread and operated through successive ages, and will continue to operate until its final object is attained, and all mankind are transformed into the image

* Whoever looks upon Christ only as the highest being developed from the germs originally implanted in human nature (although an absolutely highest being cannot logically be inferred in the development of human nature from this standing-point), must take an essentially different view from ourselves of the transaction of which we are speaking, though he may approximate to us in the mode of viewing particular points. When Hase, in his Essay on the First Christian Pentecost, in the Second Part of Winer's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (Journal for Scientific Theology), says, "that a time may arrive when what is the result of freedom in man shall be considered as divine, and the Holy Spirit;" we readily grant that such a time is coming, or rather is already come; it has already reached its highest point, from which must ensue a revolution in the mode of thinking. We cannot, however, hold this view to be the Christian one, but entirely opposite to real Christianity. How irreconcilable it is with the apostolic belief, an unprejudiced thinker, Bouterweck, acknowledges in his *Religion der Vernunft* (Religion of Reason), p. 137. The Holy Spirit, in the Christian sense, is never the divine in the nature of man, but a communication from God to the nature of man (incapable of itself of reaching its moral destination), which becomes thereby raised to a higher order of life. But this supernatural communication from God, by no means contradicts an acknowledgment of the divine and of freedom in the nature of man, but rather presupposes both.

of Christ. If we contemplate this great transaction from this, its only proper point of view, we shall not be tempted to explain the greater by the less; we shall not consider it strange that the most wonderful event in the inner life of mankind should be accompanied by extraordinary outward appearances, as sensible indications of its existence. Still less shall we be induced to look upon this great transaction—in which we recognise the necessary beginning of a new epoch, an essential intermediate step in the religious development of the Apostles, and in the formation of the Church—as something purely mythical.

The disciples must have looked forward with intense expectation to the fulfilment of that promise, which the Saviour had so emphatically repeated.* Ten days

* Professor Hitzig, in his *Sendschreiben über Ostern und Pfingsten* (Letters on Easter and Pentecost), Heidelberg, 1837, maintains, that this event occurred not at the Jewish Pentecost, but some days earlier, and that the day of the giving of the Law from Sinai is also to be fixed some days earlier; that Acts ii. 1, is to be understood, "when the day of Pentecost drew near," and therefore denotes a time before the actual occurrence of this feast. As evidence for this assertion, it is remarked that, in verse 5, only the Jews settled in Jerusalem, those who out of all the countries in which they were scattered, had settled in Jerusalem from a strong religious feeling, are mentioned, when, if the reference had been to one of the principal feasts, the multitude of *foreign* Jews, who came from all parts, would have been especially noticed. Against this view we have to urge the following considerations. The words, Acts ii. 1, "When the day of Pentecost was fully come," would be most naturally understood of the actual arrival of that day, as *πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*, or *τὸν χρόνον*, Eph. i. 10, and Gal. iv. 4, denote the actual arrival of the appointed time; though we allow that, in certain connections, they may denote the near approach of some precise point of time, as in Luke ix. 51, where yet it is to be noticed that it is not said "*the day*," but "*the days*;" and thus the time of the departure of Christ from the earth, which was now actually approaching, is marked in general terms. But as to the connection of this passage in the Acts, if we are inclined to understand these words only of the near approach of Pentecost, we do not see why such a specification of the time

had passed since their final separation from their Divine Master, when that feast was celebrated, whose object so nearly touched that which especially occupied their minds at the time, and must therefore have raised their anxious expectations still higher—the Jewish Pentecost, the feast which was held seven weeks after the Passover. This feast, according to the original Mosaic institution, related only to the first fruits of Harvest; nor is any other reason for its celebration adduced by Josephus and Philo—in this respect, only a distant resemblance could be traced between the first fruits of the natural Crea-

should have been given. Had Luke thought that the day of giving the Law on Sinai was different from that of the Pentecost, it might be expected that he would have marked more precisely the main subject. Besides, there are no traces to be found, that a day in commemoration of the giving of the Law was observed by the Jews. But if we understand the words as referring to the actual arrival of Pentecost, the importance of fixing the time, in relation to the words immediately following, and the whole sequel of the narrative, is very apparent. This feast would occasion the assembling of believers at an early hour. The words in verse 5, we must certainly understand merely of such Jews as were resident in Jerusalem, not of such who came there first at this time. But from a comparison with the 9th verse, it is evident that *κατακλιῖν* is not to be understood altogether in the same sense in both verses; that, in the latter, those are spoken of who had their residence elsewhere, and were only sojourning for a short time in Jerusalem. And if we grant that the persons spoken of belonged to the number of the Jews who formerly dwelt in other lands, but for a long time past had settled in Jerusalem, as the capital of the Theocracy, then it is clear that, by the *ἰερουσαλήναις Παράκληταις*, we must understand such as for some special cause were just come to Jerusalem. Further, there were also those called Proselytes, who were found in great numbers at Jerusalem, for some special occasion, and this could be no other than the feast of Pentecost. Doubtless, by “all the dwellers at Jerusalem,” v. 14, who are distinguished from the Jews, are meant all who were then living at Jerusalem, without determining whether they had resided there always, or only for a short time. The whole narrative, too, gives the impression that a greater multitude of persons than usual were then assembled at Jerusalem.

tion, and those of the new Spiritual Creation; this analogy, it is true, is often adverted to by the Ancient Fathers of the Church, but before the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise, must have been very far from the thoughts of the disciples. But if we venture to credit the Jewish Traditions,* this feast had also a reference to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai;† hence, by way of distinction, it has been called the feast of the joy of the Law.‡ If this be admitted, then the words of Christ respecting the new revelation of God by him, the new relation established by him between God and Man, which he himself under the designation of the New Covenant|| placed in opposition to the Old,—must have been vividly recalled to the minds of the disciples by the celebration of this feast, and, at the same time, their anxious longing would be more strongly excited for that event, which according to his promise, would confirm and glorify the New Dispensation. As all who professed to be the Lord's disciples, (their number then amounted to one hundred and twenty,)§ were wont to

* Which may be found collected in a Dissertation by J. M. Danz, in Meuschen's *Novum Testamentum e Talmude illustratum*, p. 740.

† That they are justified in making such a reference, may be concluded from comparing Exodus xii. 1, and xix. 1.

‡ שְׂמֵחַת הַתּוֹרָה.

|| The word *διαθήκη*, בְּרִית, which has been used to denote both the Old and the New Dispensation, is taken from human relations, as signifying a covenant or agreement; but in its application to the relation between God and man, the fundamental idea must never be lost sight of, namely, that of a relation in which there is something reciprocal and conditional, as, in this case, a communication from God to man is conditioned by the obedience of faith on the part of the latter.

§ Without doubt, those expositors adopt the right view who suppose, that not merely the apostles but all the believers were at that time assembled; for though, in Acts i. 26, the apostles are primarily intended, yet the *μαθηταί* collectively form the chief subject (i. 15), to which the *ἀναρρις* at the beginning of the second chapter necessarily refers. It

meet daily for mutual edification, so on this solemn day they were assembled in a chamber,* which according to Oriental customs, was specially assigned to devotional exercises. It was the first stated hour of prayer, about nine in the morning, and, according to what we must suppose was then the tone of the disciples' feelings, we may presume that their prayers turned to the object which filled their souls—that on the day when the Old Law had been promulgated with such glory, the New also might be glorified by the communication of the promised Spirit. And what their ardent desires and prayers

by no means follows, that because, in ch. ii. 14, the apostles alone are represented as speakers, the assembly was confined to these alone; but here, as elsewhere, they appear the leaders and representatives of the whole church, and distinguish themselves from the rest of the persons met together; Acts ii. 15. The great importance of the fact which Peter brings forward in his discourse, that the gifts of the Spirit, which, under the Old Covenant, were imparted only to a select class of persons, such as the prophets,—under the New Covenant, which removes every wall of separation in reference to the higher life, are communicated without distinction to all believers—this great fact would be altogether lost sight of, if we confined every thing here mentioned to the apostles. Throughout the Acts, wherever the agency of the Spirit is manifested by similar characteristics in those who were converted to a living faith, we perceive an evident homogeneity with this first great event.

* Such a chamber was built in the eastern style, with a flat roof, and a staircase leading to the court-yard, *ἡ δαὶμα*, *עליה*. According to the narrative in the Acts, we must suppose it to have been a chamber in a private house. But, in itself, there is nothing to forbid our supposing that the disciples met together in the Temple at the first hour of prayer during the feast; their proceedings would thus have gained much in notoriety, though not in real importance, as Olshausen maintains; for it perfectly accorded with the genius of the Christian Dispensation, not being restricted to particular times and places, and obliterating the distinction of profane and sacred, that the first effusion of the Holy Spirit should take place, not in a temple, but in an ordinary dwelling.

sought for, what their Lord had promised, was granted. They felt elevated to a new state of mind, pervaded by a spirit of joyfulness and power, to which they had hitherto been strangers, and seized by an inspiring impulse to testify of the grace of redemption, of which now for the first time they had right perceptions. Extraordinary appearances of nature, (a conjunction similar to what has happened in other important epochs of the history of mankind), accompanied the great process then going on in the spiritual world, and were symbolic of that which filled their inmost souls. An earthquake attended by a whirlwind suddenly shook the building in which they were assembled, a symbol to them of that Spirit which moved their inner man. Flaming lights in the form of tongues streamed through the chamber, and floating downwards settled on their heads, a symbol of the new tongues of the fire of inspired emotion, which streamed forth from the holy flame that glowed within them.*

The account of what took place on this occasion, leads us back at last to the depositions of those who were present, the only persons who could give direct testimony concerning it. And it might happen, that the glory of the inner life then imparted to them, might so reflect its splendour on surrounding objects, that by virtue of the internal miracle (the elevation of their inward life and consciousness, through the power of the Divine Spirit), the objects of outward perception appeared quite changed. And thus it is not impossible, that all which presented itself to them as a perception of the outward senses, might be, in fact, only a perception of the predominant inward mental state, a sensuous objectiveness of what was operating inwardly with divine power, similar to the ecstatic visions which are elsewhere mentioned in Holy Writ. Whatever may be thought of

* Gregory the Great beautifully remarks: "*Hinc est quod super pastores primos in linguarum specie Spiritus Sanctus insedit, quia nimirum quos repleverit de se protinus loquentes facit.*" Lib. i. Ep. 25.

this explanation, what was divine in the event remains the same, for this was an inward process in the souls of the disciples, in relation to which every thing outward was only of subordinate significance. Still, there is nothing in the narrative which renders such a supposition necessary. And if we admit, that there was really an earthquake which frightened the inhabitants out of their houses, it is easily explained how, though it happened early in the morning of the feast, a great multitude would be found in the streets, and the attention of one and another being attracted to the extraordinary meeting of the disciples, by degrees, a great crowd of persons, curious to know what was going on, would collect around the house.* The question may be asked, By what was the astonishment of the bystanders especially excited? At first sight, the words in Acts ii. 7-11 appear susceptible of but one interpretation, that the passers-by were astonished at hearing Galileans who knew no language but their own, speak in a number of foreign languages, which they could not have learnt in a natural way†—that, therefore, we must conclude that the faculty was imparted to believers by an extraordinary operation of Divine power, of speaking in foreign languages not ac-

* It may be asked, How are we to explain the difficult words *τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν*, in Acts ii. 6? The pronoun *αὐτῶν* leads us to refer the words to what immediately preceded, the loud speaking of the persons assembled. But then the use of the singular is remarkable. And since verse 2 is the principal subject, we may refer the pronoun *αὐτῶν* to that; the *ὑποκρίσεις* of verse 6 seems also to correspond to the *ᾠδαί* of verse 2. Not only is it more easy to refer the pronoun *αὐτῶν* to what immediately precedes in verse 4, but also verses 3 and 4 rather than verse 2, contain the most striking facts in the narrative; it also entirely favours this construction, that *φωνή* must be understood of the noise made by the disciples in giving vent to their feelings, and must be taken as a collective noun, signifying a confused din, in which the distinction of individual voices would be lost.

† The words give us no reason to suppose that the bystanders took offence at hearing the disciples speak of divine things in a different language from the sacred one.

quired by the use of their natural faculties. Accordingly, since the third century* it has been generally

* By many of the ancients it has been supposed—what a literal interpretation of the words ii. 8 will allow, and even favours—that the miracle consisted in this, that, though all spoke in one and the same language, each of the hearers believed that he heard them speak in his own; *μῖνον μὲν ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς, πολλὰς δὲ ἀκούοντες*." Gregory, Naz. orat. 44, f. 715, who yet does not propound this view as peculiarly his own. It has lately been brought forward in a peculiar manner by Schneckenburger, in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in's Neue Testament* (*Contributions towards an Introduction to the New Testament*), p. 84. The speakers, by the power of inspiration, operated so powerfully on the feelings of their susceptible hearers, that they involuntarily translated what went to their hearts into their mother-tongue, and understood it as if it had been spoken in that. By the element of inspiration, the inward communion of feeling was so strongly brought forth, that the lingual wall of separation was entirely taken away. But in order to determine the correctness of this mode of explanation, it may be of use to inquire,—If the language in which the hearers were addressed was quite foreign to them, the natural medium of human intercourse would be wholly wanting, and would thus be compensated by a miracle which produced an internal understanding? Or was the Aramaic language of the speakers not altogether foreign to the hearers, only not so familiar as their mother-tongue? But it was an effect of the inward communion produced by the power of spiritual influence, that they more easily understood those who spoke in a language not familiar to them, the want of familiarity was not felt. What was addressed to them was as intelligible as if spoken in their mother-tongue. In this way, although on the supposition of a powerful spiritual influence, by which the essence of the Pentecostal miracle is not denied but presupposed, it would be an explicable psychological fact. Men speaking with the ardour of inspiration, made an impression on those who were not capable of understanding a language foreign to them, similar to what we are told of Bernard's Sermons on the Crusades in Germany: "Quod germanicis etiam populis loquens miro audiebatur affectu et de sermone ejus, quem intelligere, utpote alterius lingue homines, non valebant, magis quam ex peritissimi cujuslibet post eum loquentis interpretis intellecta locutione, edificari illorum devotio videbatur, cujus rei certa probatio tonsio pectorum erat et effusio lacrimarum." Ma-

admitted, that a supernatural gift of tongues was imparted on this occasion, by which the more rapid promulgation of the gospel among the heathen was facilitated and promoted. It has been urged that as in the apostolic age, many things were effected immediately by the predominating creative agency of God's Spirit, which, in later times, have been effected through human means appropriated and sanctified by it; so, in this instance, immediate inspiration stood in the place of those natural lingual acquirements, which in later times have served for the propagation of the gospel.

But, indeed, the utility of such a gift of tongues for the spread of divine truth in the apostolic times, will appear not so great, if we consider that the gospel had its first and chief sphere of action among the nations belonging to the Roman Empire, where the knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages sufficed for this purpose, and that the one or the other of these languages, as it

billon. ed. Opp. Bernard. tom. ii. p. 1119. And this would for the most part agree with the interpretation of my honoured friend Dr Steudel. But as to the first mode of explanation, we do not see what can allow or justify our substituting for the common interpretation of the miracle in question another, which does not come nearer the psychological analogy, but, on the contrary, is farther from it, and does not so naturally connect itself with the narrative as a whole. We cannot allow an appeal to the analogy with the phenomena of animal magnetism, although, in referring to such an analogy, we find nothing objectionable, any more than in general to the analogy between the supernatural and the natural, provided the difference of psychical circumstances, and of the causes producing them, is not lost sight of. But still, in matters of science, where every thing must be well grounded, we cannot attach a value to such a document until it is ascertained what is really trustworthy in the accounts of such phenomena. As to the second mode of interpretation, it can only be maintained by our adopting the supposition, that we have here not a tradition from the first source, but only a representation, which ultimately depends on the report of eye-witnesses, and if we hence allow ourselves to distinguish what the author professes to say, from the facts lying at the basis of his narrative.

was employed in the intercourse of daily life, could not be altogether strange to the Jews. As to the Greek language, the mode in which the apostles expressed themselves in it, the traces of their mother-tongue which appear in their use of it, prove that they had obtained a knowledge of it, according to the natural laws of lingual acquirement. In the history of the first propagation of Christianity, traces are never to be found of a supernatural gift of tongues for this object. Ancient tradition, which names certain persons as interpreters of the apostles, implies the contrary.* Also, Acts xiv. 11 shews that Paul possessed no supernatural gift of tongues. Yet all this does not authorize us to deny the reference to such an endowment in the former passage of the Acts, if the explanation of the whole passage, both in single words and in its connection, is most favourable to this interpretation. Nor do we venture to decide what operations not to be calculated according to natural laws could be effected by the power with which the new divine life moved the very depths of human nature; what especially could

* Thus Mark is called the *ἑρμηνεύς*, or *ἑρμηνεύτης* of Peter; (see Papias of Hierapolis in Eusebius, Ecc. Hist. iii. 39, compared with Irenæus, iii. 1). The Basilidians say the same of one Glaucias, Clement's Stromata, vii. 765. On comparing every thing, I must decide against the possible interpretation of those words favoured by several eminent modern critics—that they mean simply an expositor, one who repeated the instructions of Peter in his Gospel, with explanatory remarks;—for this distinction of Mark is always prefixed to accounts of his Gospel, and at the same time from the fact of his acting in this capacity with Peter, his capability is inferred to note down the report made by him of the Evangelical history. Thus certainly the passage in Papias must be understood; “*Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνεύτης Πέτρου γινόμενος, ὅσα ἑρμηνεύσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν.*” The second fact is founded on the first, that he accompanied Peter as an interpreter. Some truth may lie at the basis of this tradition; it might be, that although Peter was not ignorant of the Greek language, and could express himself in it, he yet took with him a disciple who was thoroughly master of it, that he might be assisted by him in publishing the Gospel among those who spoke that language.

be effected through the connection between the internal life of the Spirit (on which the new creation operated with a power before unknown) and the faculty of speech. A phenomenon of this kind might have taken place once, with a symbolic prophetic meaning, indicating that the new divine life would reveal itself in all the languages of mankind, as Christianity is destined to bring under its sway all the various national peculiarities! A worthy symbol of this great event!

But we meet in the New Testament with other intimations of such a gift of the Spirit, which are very similar to the passages in the Acts; and the explanation of these passages is attended with fewer difficulties than that of the latter. If, therefore, we do not, contrary to the natural laws of exegesis, attempt to explain the clearer passages by the more obscure, we cannot fail to perceive that, in the section on spiritual gifts in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, something altogether different from such a supernatural gift of tongues is spoken of. Evidently, the apostle is there treating of such discourse as would not be generally intelligible, proceeding from an ecstatic state of mind which rose to an elevation far above the language of ordinary communication. We may here adduce two passages in the Acts, which cannot possibly be understood of speaking in a foreign language; x. 46, and xix. 6. How can we imagine that men, in the first glow of conversion, when first seized by the inspiring influence of Christian faith, instead of pouring forth the feelings of which their hearts were full, through a medium so dear and easy to them as their mother-tongue, could find pleasure in what at such a time would be a mere epideictic miracle, unless the effect of being filled with the Spirit was to hurry them along, as blind instruments of a magical power, against their wills, and to constrain them to make use of a different language from that which at such a time must have been best fitted for the expression of their feelings?*

* I cannot comprehend what Professor Bäumlein maintains in his Essay on this subject, in the "*Studien der evan-*

Both these suppositions are at variance with the spirit of the gospel, nor does any thing similar appear in the first history of Christianity. Such exhibitions would be peculiarly suited to draw away the mind from that which is the essence of conversion, and only to furnish aliment for an unchristian vanity. On the other hand, there seems a propriety in referring these passages to the utterance of the new things with which the mind would be filled, in the new language of a heart glowing with Christian sentiment.* Thus it may be explained how, in the first passage (Acts x. 46), the *γλῶσσαι λαλῶν* is connected with "praising God," "praising God with the whole heart," when conscious of having through his grace received salvation; and in the second passage, Acts xix. 6, with *προφητεῖαν*. But as, in both these passages, it is plainly shewn that the communication of the Divine Spirit was indicated by characteristics similar to those of its original effusion at Pentecost, we are furnished with a valuable clue to the right understanding of that event.

If, then, we examine more closely the description of what transpired on the day of Pentecost, we shall find several things which favour a different interpretation from the ancient one. How could a number of carnally-mind-

gelischen Geistlichkeit Württembergs" (Studies of the Evangelical Clergy of Württemberg) vi. 2. p. 119, "that in certain religious mental states, the speaking in foreign languages is by no means unnatural." It is plain that a man may easily feel himself impelled, when actuated by new feelings and ideas, to form new words; as from a new spiritual life, a new religious dialect forms itself. But how, under such circumstances, it can be natural to speak a language altogether foreign, I cannot perceive, nor can I find any analogy for it in other psychical phenomena. Still less can I admit the comparison with the manifestations among the followers of Mr Irving in London, since, as far as my knowledge extends, I can see nothing in these manifestations but the workings of an enthusiastic spirit, which sought to copy the apostolic gift of tongues according to the common interpretation, and therefore assumed the reality of that gift.

* See the Dissertation of Dr David Schulz on the Spiritual Gifts of the first Christians. Breslau, 1836.

ed men be led to explain the speaking of the disciples in foreign languages, as the effect of intoxication? Acts ii. 13.* How did it happen, that Peter in his apologetic discourse did not appeal to the undeniably miraculous nature of an event by which the objections of men unsusceptible of what was divine, might most easily be refuted? Why did he satisfy himself with referring to the prophetic declarations respecting an extraordinary revival, and an effusion of the Spirit, which was to take place in the times of the Messiah, without even advert-ing to this peculiar manifestation? In the construction of the whole narrative, we find nothing that obliges us to adopt the notion of a supernatural gift of tongues in the usual sense. The flames that settled on their heads appear as the natural symbols of the new tongues, or new language of that holy fire which was kindled in the hearts of the disciples, by the power of the Holy Spirit, and accordingly it is said, "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues† as the Spirit gave them utterance;" therefore, the tongues of the Spirit were the new form for the new spirit which animated them.

It appears indeed, to militate against this interpreta-

* Although this may not be considered as absolutely necessary, for it would certainly be possible, that frivolous, carnally-minded men who were disposed to ridicule what they did not understand, might not observe the phenomenon (not explicable from common causes) of speaking in a foreign language; it is possible that Peter, after he had shewn the contrariety of the inspiration of the apostle to a state of intoxication, which could hardly have taken place at that hour of the day, instead of adducing other marks which testified against it, passed on to compare the phenomena with the prophetic promise which was here fulfilled. Yet it is not at all probable that Peter, since he refers to the hour of the day, in order to refute the charge of intoxication, should not also refer to that other fact (supposing it to exist) which would have completed his proof.

† The word *γλῶσσα*, like the German *Zunge* [and the English *tongue*] is used both for the bodily organ of speech, and for a language or dialect.

tion, and to establish the common one, that the spectators are described as expressing their astonishment at hearing, each one in his own tongue, these Galileans who knew no foreign language, speaking the wonderful works of God (Acts ii. 8); and more than this, we have the various nations distinctly named in whose languages the apostles spoke. But we cannot possibly think that all these nations spoke different languages, for it is certain that, in the cities of Cappadocia, Pontus, Lesser Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Cyrene, and in the parts of Lybia and Egypt inhabited by Grecian and Jewish Colonies, the Greek would at that time be in general better understood than the ancient language of the country, and as this must have been known to the writer of the Acts, he could not have intended to specify so many different languages. There will remain out of the whole catalogue of languages, only the Persian, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and Latin. It also deserves notice, that the inhabitants of Judea are mentioned, who spoke the same language as the Galileans, only with a slight difference of pronunciation. Since, then, to retain the ancient view of the gift of tongues, creates difficulties in this passage, which is the only one that can serve to support it; while several parts of the narrative oppose it, and every thing that is said elsewhere of this gift (*χαρίσματα*) leads to a very different interpretation, the more ancient view becomes very uncertain, though we cannot arrive at a perfectly clear and certain conclusion respecting the facts which form the groundwork of the narrative. Perhaps the difficulty in the passage may be obviated in this way. It was not unusual to designate all the disciples of the Lord, Galileans, and it might be inferred from this common appellation that they were all Galileans by birth; but it by no means follows that this was actually the case. Among the so-called Galileans, some might be found whose mother-tongue was not the Galilean dialect, and who now felt themselves impelled to express the fulness of their hearts in their own provincial dialect, which through Christianity had become a sacred language to them, though hitherto they had been accustomed to consider the Hebrew only

in that light;* and it might also happen that some who lived on the confines of Galilee, had learned the language of the adjacent tribes, which they now made use of, in order to be better understood by foreigners. Thus the speaking in foreign languages would be only something accidental, and not the essential of the new language of the Spirit.† This new language of the Spirit is that which Christ promised to his disciples, as one of the essential marks of the operation of the Holy Spirit on their hearts. Indeed, the promise that they should speak with new tongues,‡ appears only in the critically suspected addition to the Gospel of Mark, but it does not follow that a true tradition does not lie at the basis of it; and if Christ in the other Gospels has not literally made use of this expression, still we find what is allied to it in meaning, where he speaks of the new powers of utterance which would be imparted by the Holy Spirit to the disciples, "I will give you a mouth and wisdom," Luke xxi. 15. Thus this expression, "to speak with new tongues," would mean, to speak with such tongues as the Spirit gave them; other tongues than those hitherto used, originally intended to mark the great revolution effected by Christianity in the dispositions of men wherever it found entrance, among the rude as well as the civilized.¶ Yet we do not venture to as-

* See Acts xxii. 2. Wetstein on Acts vi. 1. On this point the views of the Palestinian theologians would differ, according as their general mode of thinking was more or less contracted.

† Whatever interpretation be adopted of this passage, it will be no more than a conjecture for the solution of that difficulty, nor can any be given with the degree of certainty equal to what may be attained respecting the gift of tongues in a general point of view.

‡ This evidently denoted such tongues or languages as were not yet in the world. Had the person who committed this tradition to writing intended foreign languages not acquired by study, he would certainly have made use of a different expression.

¶ Gregory the Great beautifully remarks, in his Homil. in Evang. l. ii. H. 29: "Fideles quique, qui jam vitæ veteris secularia verba derelinquunt, sancta autem mysteria insonant,

sume that the meaning of the expression remained invariably the same, for this would be inconsistent with its use in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, of which we shall speak hereafter. As the original form of the expression in the Christian phraseology gradually was shortened in many ways,* so likewise there was a gradual alteration in the meaning; that alteration, namely, of which many examples are elsewhere found in the history of language, that a word which at first was altogether the general sign of a certain idea, became in later times, as various shades of meaning were attached to this idea, limited to one particular application of it. Thus it came to pass, that an expression which originally denoted the new

conditoris sui laudes et potentiam quantum prævalent, narrant, quid aliud faciunt, nisi novis linguis loquuntur?" The view I have here taken is nearly the same as that of Herder in his Treatise on the Pentecostal Gift of Tongues,—of Hase, and particularly of Bauer, in his valuable essay on the subject in the "*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*," 1830. Part II. to which I am indebted for some modifications of my own view. My honoured friend Stendel, in the same periodical, adopts a view essentially the same. It has also found an advocate in Dr Schulz. With Bleek (see his learned and acute Dissertations in the *Studien und Kritiken*), I agree in the general view of the subject, but not in the explanation of the word *γλῶσσα*. Other grounds apart, adduced by Bauer, it appears to me far more natural to deduce the designation for the new form of Christian inspiration, in reference to the Hebrew *רוח קדש*, as well as the Greek *γλῶσσα*, from the language of common life rather than from the schools of grammarians. But the question, whether, in this connection, the word must originally be understood, of the organ of language (according to Bauer), or of the kind of language, does not appear to me so very important, for in this instance both meanings of the word are closely allied.

* Winer justly remarks, in the last edition of his Grammar, p. 534, (*Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*, 4th Ed., Leipzig, 1836), that, in the phrase *γλῶσσας λαλῶν*, a word like *λαλῶν* cannot legitimately be supplied; but it may be assumed that, from the original complete phrase, after it had once acquired a fixed meaning, a shorter elliptical phrase was formed, as there was occasion to employ it frequently.

language of Christians under the influence of the Spirit generally, afterwards, when various modifications of such language had been formed, became limited to that kind in which the immediate influences of the Spirit predominated, and presented itself in the higher self-consciousness as the specially ecstatic form,* while the discursive ac-

* This continued to be the general use of the term for the first two centuries, until the historical connection with the youthful age of the church being broken, the notion of a supernatural gift of tongues was formed. On this point, it is worth while to compare some passages of Irenæus and Tertullian. Irenæus (lib. v. c. 9) cites what Paul says of the wisdom of the perfect, and then adds, Paul calls those perfect, "Qui perceperunt Spiritum Dei et omnibus linguis loquuntur per Spiritum Dei, quemadmodum et ipse loquebatur, καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ἐκύνουν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ ἑκκλησίᾳ προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἔχοντες καὶ παντοδαπαῖς λαλοῦντες διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος γλώσσας καὶ τὰ κρύβητα τῶν ἀδελφῶν εἰς φανερὸν ἐργάζονται ἐν τῇ συντροφίᾳ καὶ τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκδηγοῦνται, quos et spirituales apostolus vocat." Though some persons think the term *παντοδαπαῖς* undoubtedly refers to the languages of various nations, I do not see how that can be, according to its use at that time, though the original meaning of the word might be so understood. It is particularly worthy of notice, that Irenæus represents this gift as one of the essential marks of Christian perfection, as a characteristic of the *spirituales*. We cannot well comprehend how he could suppose any thing so detached and accidental as speaking in many foreign languages, to stand in so close and necessary a connection with the essence of Christian inspiration. Besides, he speaks of it as one of those gifts of the Spirit, which continued to exist in the church even in his own times. He evidently considers the *γλώσσας λαλῶν* as something allied to *προφητεῖαι*. To the latter, he attributes the faculty of bringing to light the hidden thoughts of men, and to the former that of publishing divine mysteries. He sees nothing but this in the gift of tongues at the effusion of the Holy Spirit, and, in reference to that event, places together "prophetari et loqui linguis," l. iii. c. 12. Tertullian demands of Marcion to point out among his followers proofs of ecstatic inspiration: "Edat aliquem psalmum, aliquam visionem, aliquam orationem duntaxat spirituales in ecstasi. i. e. amentia, si qua lingua interpretatio accesserit." Evidently in this connection, the term *lingua*, expressing speaking in an ecstasy, which, since what

tivity of the understanding with the lower self-consciousness for the time lay dormant.

After having attempted to clear up these different points, we shall be better able to give a sketch of the whole scene on that memorable day.

The shock of the earthquake occasions the concourse of many persons in the streets from various quarters, as the festival had brought Jews and Proselytes from all parts of the world to Jerusalem. The assembling of the disciples attracts their notice; by degrees a crowd of curious inquirers is collected, many of whom probably enter the assembly in order to inform themselves accurately of the affair. The disciples now turn to these strangers, and, constrained by the impulse of the Spirit, announce to them what filled their hearts. The impression made by their words varies with the dispo-

is spoken in this state cannot be generally intelligible, an interpretation must accompany. Tertullian also, in the same passage (*adv. Marcion*, l. v. c. 8), applying the words in Isaiah xi. 2 to the Christian church, joins *prophetari* with *linguis loqui*, and attributes both to the *Spiritus agnitionis*, the *πνεῦμα γνωσεως*. It further appears from what has been said, that the gift of tongues was considered as still existing in the church; and it is strange that the Fathers never refer to it apologetically, as an undeniable evidence to the heathen of the divine power operating among Christians, in the same manner as they appeal to the gift of healing the sick, or of casting out demons, although the ability to speak in a variety of languages which could not be acquired in a natural way, must have been very astonishing to the heathen. In Origen, in whose times the Charismata of the apostolic church began to be considered as something belonging to the past, we find the first trace of the opinion that has since been prevalent, yet even in him the two views are mingled, as might be done by the distinction of the twofold mode of interpretation, the literal and the spiritual. Compare Ep. ad Roman. ed. de la Rue, t. iv. f. 470. l. vii. f. 602, de oratione § 2, tom. i. f. 199. The opposition to Montanism, which had subjected the *γλωσσαις λαλῶν* to abuse, as in the Corinthian Church, might contribute to sink into oblivion the more ancient interpretation. The *ἐκφανῶν*, the *λαλῶν ἐκφρασις καὶ ἀλλοτριωτισμός* came to be considered as a mark of the spurious Montanist Inspiration, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. v. 16.

sitions of their hearers. Some feel themselves affected by the energy of inspiration with which the disciples spoke, but can give no clear account of the impressions made by the whole affair. Instead of asking themselves, "Whence proceeds that power with which we hear these men speak who were not educated in the schools of the scribes?" their wonder is directed only to what was most external. How comes it to pass that these Galileans speak in foreign tongues? Others who have been impressed without any precise consciousness, give vent to their astonishment in general expressions, What can all this mean? But those who were utterly unsusceptible and light-minded, ridicule and reject what they are unable to comprehend.

The apostles held it to be their duty, to defend the Christian community against the reproaches cast upon it by superficial judges, and to avail themselves of the impression which this spectacle had made on so many, to lead them to faith in Him whose divine power was here manifested. Peter came forward with the rest of the eleven, and as the apostles spoke in the name of the whole church, so Peter spoke in the name of the apostles. The promptitude and energy which made him take the lead in expressing the sentiments with which all were animated, were special endowments, founded on his natural character; hence the distinguished place which he had already taken among the disciples, and which he long after held in the first church at Jerusalem. "Think not," said Peter,* "that in these unwonted appearances, you see the effects of inebriety. These are the signs of the Messianic era, predicted by the prophet Joel; the

* Bleek has correctly perceived traces of a Hebrew original in Acts ii. 24, where the connection of the metaphor makes *ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι* = *מֵתָּהּ חֲבֵלִי* or *שְׂאוֹל*, Psalm xviii. 5 and 6, which the Alexandrian renders by *سُورٍ*, according to the meaning of the word *חֲבֵל*. See Bleek's review of Mayerhoff's "*Hist. Kritischer Einleitung in die hebraischen Schriften*," in the *Studien und Kritiken*. 1836, iv. 1021.

manifestations of an extraordinary effusion of the Spirit, which is not limited to an individual here and there, the chosen organs of the Most High, but in which all share who have entered into a new relation to God by faith in the Messiah. This Messianic era will be distinguished, as the prophet foretold, by various extraordinary appearances, as precursors of the last decisive epoch of the general judgment. But whoever believes in the Messiah has no cause to fear that judgment, but may be certain of salvation. That Jesus of Nazareth, whose divine mission was verified to you by the miracles that attended his earthly course, is the very Messiah promised in the Old Testament. Let not his ignominious death be urged as invalidating his claims. It was necessary for the fulfilment of his work as the Messiah, and determined by the counsel of God. The events that followed his death are a proof of this, for he rose from the dead, of which we are all witnesses, and has been exalted to heaven by the divine power. From the extraordinary appearances which have filled you with astonishment, you perceive, that in his glorified state he is now operating with divine energy among those who believe on him. The heavenly Father has promised that the Messiah shall fill all who believe on him with the power of the divine spirit, and this promise is now being fulfilled. Learn, then, from these events, in which you behold the prophecies of the Old Testament fulfilled, the nothingness of all that you have attempted against him, and know that God has exalted him whom you crucified to be Messiah, the ruler of God's kingdom, and that through divine power, he will overcome all his enemies."

The words of Peter deeply impressed many, who anxiously asked, What must we do? Peter called upon them to repent of their sins, to believe in Jesus as the Messiah who could impart to them forgiveness of sins and freedom from sin,—in this faith to be baptized, and thus outwardly to join the communion of the Messiah; then would the divine power of faith be manifested in them, as it had already been in the community of believers; they would receive the same gifts of the Holy

Spirit, the bestowment of which was simultaneous with the forgiveness of sins, and freedom from sin; for the promise related to all believers without distinction, even to all in distant parts of the world, whom God by his grace should lead to believe in Jesus as the Messiah.

A question may be raised, Whether by these last words Peter intended only the Jews scattered among distant nations, or whether he included those among the heathen themselves who might be brought to the faith? As Peter at a subsequent period, opposed the propagation of the gospel among the heathen, there would be an apparent inconsistency in his now making such a reference. But there is really no such contradiction, for the scruple which clung so closely to Peter's mind, was founded only on his belief that heathens could not be received into the community of believers, without first becoming Jewish Proselytes, by the exact observance of the Mosaic law. Now, according to the declarations of the prophets, he might expect that in the Messianic times, the heathen would be brought to join in the worship of Jehovah, so that this sentiment might occur to him consistently with the views he then held, and he might express it without giving offence to the Jews. Yet this explanation is not absolutely necessary, for all the three clauses (Acts ii. 39) might be used only to denote the aggregate of the Jewish nation in its full extent; and we might rather expect that Peter, who had been speaking of the Jews present and their children, if he had thought of the heathen also, would have carefully distinguished them from the Jews. On the other hand, the description, "All that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," appears too comprehensive to justify us in confining it to persons originally belonging to the Jewish nation. Hence, it is most probable, that in Peter's mind, when he used this expression, there floated an indistinct allusion to believers from other nations, though it did not appear of sufficient importance for him to give it a greater prominence in his address, as it was his conviction, that the converts to Christianity from heathenism must first become Jews.

CHAPTER II.

THE FIRST FORM OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY, AND THE FIRST GERM OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE existence and first development of the Christian church rests on an historical foundation—on the acknowledgment of the fact that Jesus was the Messiah—not on a certain system of ideas. Hence, at first, all those who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, separated from the mass of the Jewish people, and formed themselves into a distinct community. In the course of time, it became apparent, who were genuine, and who were false disciples; but all who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah were baptized without fuller or longer instruction, such as in later times has preceded baptism. There was only one article of faith which formed the peculiar mark of the Christian profession, and from this point believers were led to a clearer and perfect knowledge of the whole contents of the Christian faith, by the continual enlightening of the Holy Spirit. Believing that Jesus was the Messiah, they ascribed to him the whole idea of what the Messiah was to be, according to the meaning and spirit of the Old Testament promises, rightly understood; they acknowledged him as the Redeemer from sin, the Ruler of the kingdom of God, to whom their whole lives were to be devoted, whose laws were to be followed in all things; while he would manifest himself as the ruler of God's kingdom, by the communication of a new divine principle of life, which to those who are redeemed and governed by him imparts the certainty of the forgiveness of sins. This divine principle of life, must (they believed) mould their whole lives to a conformity with the laws of the Messiah and his kingdom, and would be the pledge of all the blessings to be imparted to them in the kingdom of God until its consummation. Whoever acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, received him con-

sequently as the infallible divine prophet, and implicitly submitted to his instructions as communicated by his personal ministry, and afterwards by his inspired organs, the apostles. Hence baptism at this period, in its peculiar Christian meaning, referred to this one article of faith, which constituted the essence of Christianity, as baptism into Jesus, into the name of Jesus; it was the holy rite which sealed the connection with Jesus as the Messiah. From this signification of baptism, we cannot indeed, conclude with certainty, that there was only one form of baptism. Still, it is probable, that in the original apostolic formula, no reference was made except to this one article. This shorter baptismal formula contains in itself every thing which is further developed in the words used by Christ at the institution of baptism, but which he did not intend to establish as an exact formula; the reference to God, who has revealed and shewn himself in and by the Son, as a Father; and to the Spirit of the Father, whom Christ imparts to believers as the new spirit of life; the Spirit of holiness, who by virtue of this intervention is distinguished as the spirit of Christ. That one article of faith included, therefore, the whole of Christian doctrine. But the distinct knowledge of its contents was by no means developed in the minds of the first converts, or freed from foreign admixtures resulting from Jewish modes of thinking, which required that religious ideas should be stripped of that national and carnal veil with which they were covered. As the popular Jewish notion of the Messiah excluded many things which were characteristic of this idea, as formed and understood in a Christian sense, and as it included many elements not in accordance with Christian views, one result was, that in the first Christian communities which were formed among the Jews, various discordant notions of religion were mingled; there were many errors arising from the prevailing Jewish mode of thinking, some of which were by degrees corrected, in the case of those who surrendered themselves to the expansive and purifying influence of the Christian spirit; but in those over whom that spirit could not exert such power, these errors formed the germ of the later

Jewish-Christian (the so-called Ebionitish) doctrine which set itself in direct hostility to the pure gospel.

Thus we are not justified in assuming that the Three Thousand who were converted on one day, became transformed at once into genuine Christians. The Holy Spirit operated then, as in all succeeding ages, by the publication of divine truth, not with a sudden transforming magical power, but according to the measure of the free self-determination of the human will. Hence, also, in these first Christian societies, as in all later ones, although originating in so mighty an operation of the Holy Spirit, the foreign and spurious were mingled with the genuine. In fact, in proportion to the might and energy of the operation, many persons were more easily carried away by the first impressions of divine truth, whose hearts were not a soil suited for the divine seed to take deep root and develope itself; and in outward appearance, there were no infallible marks of distinction between genuine and merely apparent conversions. The example of Ananias and Sapphira, and the disputes of the Palestinian and Hellenistic Christians, evince even at that early period, that the agency of the Spirit did not preserve the church entirely pure from foreign admixtures. It happened then, as in the great religious revivals of other times, that many were borne along by the force of excited feelings, without having (as their subsequent conduct proved) their disposition effectually penetrated by the Holy Spirit.

The form of the Christian community and of the public Christian worship, the archetype of all the later Christian Cultus, arose at first, without any preconceived plan, from the peculiar nature of the higher life that belonged to all true Christians. There was, however, this difference, that the first Christian community formed as it were one family; the power of the newly awakened feeling of Christian fellowship, the feeling of the common grace of redemption, outweighed all other personal and public feelings, and all other relations were subordinated to this one great relation. But, in later times, the distinction between the church and the family became more mark-

ed, and many things which were at first accomplished in the church as a family community, could latterly be duly attended to only in the narrower communion of Christian family life.

The first Christians assembled daily either in the Temple, or in private houses; in the latter case, they met in small companies, since their numbers were already too great for one chamber to hold them all. Discourses on the doctrine of salvation were addressed to believers and to those who were just won over to the faith, and prayers were offered up. As the predominant consciousness of the enjoyment of redemption brought under its influence and sanctified the whole of earthly life, nothing earthly could remain untransformed by this relation to a higher state. The daily meal of which believers partook as members of one family was sanctified by it.* They commemorated the last Supper of the disciples with Christ, and their brotherly union with one another. At the close of the meal, the president distributed bread and wine to the persons present, as a memorial of Christ's similar distribution to the disciples. Thus every meal was consecrated to the Lord, and, at the same time, was a meal of brotherly love. Hence the designations afterwards chosen were, *δῆπνον κυρίου* and *ἀγάπη*. †

* The hypothesis lately revived, that such institutions were borrowed from the Essenes, is so entirely gratuitous as to require no refutation.

† In Acts ii. 42, we find the first general account of what passed in the assemblies of the first Christians. Mosheim thinks, since every thing else is mentioned that is found in later meetings of the church, that the *κοινωνία* refers to the collections made on these occasions. But the context does not favour the use of the word *κοινωνία* in so restricted a signification, which, therefore, if it were the meaning intended, would require a more definite term. See Meyer's Commentary. We may most naturally consider it as referring to the whole of the social Christian intercourse, two principal parts of which were, the common meal and prayer. Luke mentions prayer last of all, probably because the connection between the common meal and prayer, which made an essential

From ancient times, an opinion has prevailed, which is apparently favoured by many passages in the Acts, that the spirit of brotherly love impelled the first Christians to renounce all their earthly possessions, and to establish a perfect intercommunity of goods. When, in later times, it was perceived how very much the Christian life had receded from the model of this fellowship of brotherly love, an earnest longing to regain it was awakened, to which we must attribute some attempts to effect what had been realized by the first glow of love in the apostolic times—such were the orders of Monkhood, the Mendicant Friars, the Apostolici, and the Waldenses in the 12th and 13th centuries. At all events, supposing this opinion to be well founded, this practice of the apostolic church ought not to be considered as in a literal sense the ideal for imitation in all succeeding ages; it must have been a deviation from the natural course of social development, such as could agree only with the extraordinary manifestation of the divine life in the human race at that particular period. Only the *spirit* and *disposition* here manifested in thus amalgamating the earthly possessions of numbers into one common fund, are the models for the church in its

part of the love-feast, was floating in his mind. Olshausen maintains (see his Commentary, 2d ed. p. 629), that this interpretation is inadmissible, because in this enumeration, every thing relates to divine worship, as may be inferred from the preceding expression *ἡ δόξα*. But this supposition is wanting in proof. According to what we have before remarked, the communion of the church, and of the family, were not at that time separated from one another; no strict line of demarcation was drawn between what belonged to the Christian Cultus in a narrower sense, and what related to the Christian life and communion generally. Nor can the reason alleged by Olshausen be valid, that if my interpretation were correct, the word *καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη* must have been placed first, for it is altogether in order that *that* should be placed first, which alone refers to the directive functions of the apostles, that then the mention should follow of the reciprocal Christian communion of all the members with one another, and that of this communion, two particulars should be especially noticed.

development through all ages. For as Christianity never subverts the existing natural course of development in the human race, but sanctifies it by a new spirit, it necessarily recognises the division of wealth (based on that development), and the inequalities arising from it in the social relations; while it draws from these inequalities materials for the formation and exercise of Christian virtue, and strives to lessen them by the only true and never failing means,* the power, namely, of love. This, we find, agrees with the practice of the churches subsequently founded by the apostles, and with the directions given by Paul for the exercise of Christian liberality, 2 Cor. viii. 13. Still, if we are disposed to consider this community of goods, as only the effect of a peculiar and temporary manifestation of Christian zeal, and foreign to the later development of the church, we shall find many difficulties even in this mode of viewing it. The first Christians formed themselves into no monkish fraternities, nor lived as hermits secluded from the rest of the world, but, as history shews us, continued in the same civil relations as before their conversion;

* As the influence which Christianity exercises over mankind is not always accompanied with a clear discernment of its principles, there have been many erroneous tendencies, which, though hostile to Christianity, have derived their nourishment from it, half-truths torn from their connection with the whole body of revealed truth, and hence misunderstood and misapplied; of this, the St Simonians furnish an example. They had before them an indistinct conception of the Christian idea of equality; but as it was not understood in the Christian sense, they have attempted to realize it in a different manner. They have striven to accomplish by outward arrangements, what Christianity aims at developing gradually through the mind and disposition, and have thus fallen into absurdities. Christianity tends by the spirit of love to reduce the opposition between the individual and the community, and to produce an harmonious amalgamation of both. St Simonianism, on the contrary, practically represents the pantheistic tendency, of which the theory is so prevalent in Germany in the present day; it sacrifices the individual to the community, and thus deprives the latter of its true vital importance.

nor have we any proofs that a community of goods was universal for a time, and was then followed by a return to the usual arrangements of society. On the contrary, several circumstances mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, are at variance with the notion of such a relinquishment of private property. Peter said expressly to Ananias, that it depended on himself to sell or to keep his land, and that, even after the sale, the sum received for it was entirely at his own disposal, Acts v. 4. In the 6th chapter of the Acts, there is an account of a distribution of alms to the widows, but not a word is said of a common stock for the support of the whole body of believers. We find in Acts xii. 12, that Mary possessed a house at Jerusalem, which we cannot suppose to have been purchased at the general cost. These facts plainly shew, that we are not to imagine even in this first Christian society, a renunciation of all private property.*

* Or we must assume, that as the power of the newly awakened feeling of Christian fellowship overcame every other consideration, and wholly repressed the other social relations that are based on the constitution of human nature, which after a while resumed their rights, and became appropriated as special forms of Christian fellowship, and that as the church and family life were melted into one, it would well agree with the development of a state so natural to the infancy of the church, that by the overpowering feeling of Christian fellowship, all distinction of property should cease, which would be accomplished from an inward impulse without formal consultation or legal prescription. But after experience had shewn how untenable such an arrangement was, this original community of goods would gradually lead to the formation of a common fund or chest, which would not interfere with the limits of private property. But in the Acts these two gradations in the social arrangements of the church might not be distinctly marked, nor would it be in our power to trace step by step the process of development. Still, we want sufficient grounds for this assumption. The poverty of the church at Jerusalem has indeed been adduced as an ill consequence of that original community of goods. But this cannot be taken as a sure proof of the fact; for since Christianity at first found acceptance among the poorer classes, and the distress of the people at Jerusalem in those times must have been extreme, it can be explained without having recourse to such a supposition.

Therefore, when we are told, "The whole multitude of believers were of one heart and of one soul, and had all things common," &c., it is not to be understood literally, but as a description of that brotherly love which repressed all selfish feelings, and caused the wealthier believers to regard their property as belonging to their needy brethren, so ready were they to share it with them. And when it is added, "that they sold their possessions, and distribution was made to every man according as he had need," it is to be understood according to what has just been said. A common chest was established, from which the necessities of the poorer members of the church were supplied, and perhaps certain expenses incurred by the whole church, such as the celebration of the Agapæ, were defrayed; and in order to increase their contributions, many persons parted with their estates. Probably, a union of this kind existed among the persons who attended the Saviour, and ministered to his necessities, Luke viii. 3; and a fund for similar purposes was afterwards formed by public collections in the apostolic churches.*

This practice of the first Christians, as we have remarked, has been rendered memorable by the fate of Ananias and Sapphira. Their example shews, how far the apostles were from wishing to extort by outward requirements what ought to proceed spontaneously from the power of the Spirit; they looked only for the free actings of a pure disposition. A man named Ananias, and his wife Sapphira, were anxious not to be considered by the apostles and the church as inferior to others in the liberality of their contributions. Probably, a superstitious belief in the merit of good works was mingled with other motives, so that they wished to be at the same time meritorious in God's sight. They could not, however, prevail on themselves to surrender the whole of their property, but brought a part, and pretended that it was the whole. Peter detected the dissimulation

* This is confessedly no new view, but one adopted by Heumann, Mosheim, and others before them.

and hypocrisy of Ananias, whether by a glance into the secret recesses of his heart, imparted by the immediate influence of God's Spirit, or by a natural sagacity derived from the same source, we cannot decide with certainty from the narrative. Nor is it a question of importance, for who can so exactly draw the line between the divine and the human, in organs animated by the Holy Spirit? The criminality of Ananias did not consist in his not deciding to part with the whole amount of his property; for the words of Peter addressed to him shew that no exact measure of giving was prescribed; each one was left to contribute according to his peculiar circumstances, and the degree of love that animated him. But the hypocrisy with which he attempted to make a show of greater love than he actually felt—the falsehood by which, when it took possession of his soul, the Christian life must have been utterly polluted and adulterated—this it was which Peter denounced as a work of the spirit of Satan, for falsehood is the fountain of all evil. Peter charged him with lying to the Holy Spirit; with lying not to men but to God; since he must have beheld in the apostles the organs of the Holy Spirit speaking and acting in God's name—(that God who was himself present in the assembly of believers, as a witness of his intentions)—and yet thought that he could obtain credit before God for his good works. Peter uttered his solemn rebuke with a divine confidence, springing from a regard to that holy cause which was to be preserved from all foreign mixtures, and from the consciousness of being in an office entrusted to him by God, and in which he was supported by divine power. When we reflect what Peter was in the eyes of Ananias, how the superstitious hypocrite must have been confounded and thunderstruck to see his falsehood detected, how the holy denunciations of a man speaking to his conscience with such divine confidence must have acted on his terrified feelings, we shall find it not very difficult to conceive that the words of the apostle would produce so great an effect. The divine and the natural seem here to have been closely connected. What Paul

so confidently asserts in his Epistles to the Corinthians, of his ability of inflicting punishment, testifies of the conscious possession by the apostles of such divine power. And when Sapphira, without suspecting what had taken place, three hours after, entered the assembly, Peter at first endeavoured to rouse her conscience by his interrogations : but since, instead of being aroused to consideration and repentance, she was hardened in her hypocrisy, Peter accused her of having concerted with her husband, to put, as it were, the Spirit of God to the proof, whether he might not be deceived by their hypocrisy. He then menaced her with the judgment of God, which had just been inflicted on her husband. The words of the apostle were in this instance aided by the impression of her husband's fate, and striking the conscience of the hypocrite, produced the same effect as on her husband. So terrible was this judgment, in order to guard the first operations of the Holy Spirit, before the admixture of that poison which is always most prejudicial to the operations of divine power on mankind ; and to secure a reverence for the apostolic authority, which was so important as an external governing power for the development of the primitive church, until it had advanced to an independent steadfastness and maturity in the faith.

The disciples had not yet attained a clear understanding of that call, which Christ had already given them by so many intimations, to form a Church entirely separated from the existing Jewish economy ; to that economy they adhered as much as possible ; all the forms of the national theocracy were sacred in their esteem, it seemed the natural element of their religious consciousness, though a higher principle of life had been imparted, by which that consciousness was to be progressively inspired and transformed. They remained outwardly Jews, although, in proportion as their faith in Jesus as the Redeemer became clearer and stronger—they would inwardly cease to be Jews, and all external rites would assume a different relation to their internal life. It was their belief, that the existing re-

ligious forms would continue till the second coming of Christ, when a new and higher order of things would be established, and this great change they expected would shortly take place. Hence the establishment of a distinct mode of worship was far from entering their thoughts. Although new ideas respecting the essence of true worship arose in their minds from the light of faith in the Redeemer, they felt as great an interest in the Temple worship as any devout Jews. They believed, however, that a sifting would take place among the members of the theocracy, and that the better part would, by the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, be incorporated with the Christian community. As the believers, in opposition to the mass of the Jewish nation who remained hardened in their unbelief, now formed a community internally bound together by the one faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and by the consciousness of the higher life received from him, it was necessary that this internal union should assume a certain external form. And a model for such a smaller community within the great national theocracy already existed among the Jews, along with the Temple worship, namely, the *Synagogues*. The means of religious edification which they supplied, took account of the religious welfare of all, and consisted of united prayers and the addresses of individuals who applied themselves to the study of the Old Testament. These means of edification closely corresponded to the nature of the new Christian worship. This form of social worship, as it was copied in all the religious communities founded on Judaism, (such as the Essenes) was also adopted to a certain extent at the first formation of the Christian church. But it may be disputed, whether the Apostles, to whom Christ committed the chief direction of affairs, designed from the first that believers should form a society exactly on the model of the Synagogue, and, in pursuance of this plan, instituted particular offices for the government of the church corresponding to that model—or whether, without such a preconceived plan, distinct offices were appointed, as circumstances required, in doing which

they would avail themselves of the model of the synagogue with which they were familiar.

The advocates of the first scheme (particularly Mosheim) proceed on the undeniably correct assumption, that the existence of certain presidents at the head of the Christian societies, under the name of Elders (*πρεσβύτεροι*) must be presupposed, though their appointment is not expressly mentioned, as appears from Acts xi. 30. The question arises, Whether even earlier traces cannot be found of the existence of such Presbyters? The appointment of deacons is indeed first mentioned as designed to meet a special emergency, but it seems probable that their office was already in existence. It may be presumed, that the apostles, in order not to be called off from the more weighty duties of their office, appointed from the beginning such almoners; but as these officers hitherto had been chosen only from the native Jewish Christians of Palestine, the Christians of Jewish descent, who came from other parts of the Roman Empire, and to whom the Greek was almost as much their mother-tongue as the Aramaic, the Hellenists as they were termed—believed that they were unjustly treated. On their remonstrance, deacons of Hellenistic descent were especially appointed for them, as appears by their Greek names. As the apostles declared that they were averse from being distracted in their purely spiritual employment of prayer and preaching the word by the distribution of money, we may reasonably infer that even before this time, they had not engaged in such business, but had transferred it to other persons appointed for the purpose. Still earlier, in Acts v., we find mention made of persons under the title of *παισιμαχοι*, *παισιμαχοι*, who considered such an employment as carrying a corpse out of the Christian assemblies for burial as belonging to their office, so that they seem to have been no other than deacons. And as the title of younger stands in contrast with that of elders in the church, the existence of servants of the church (*διακονοι*), and of ruling elders (*πρεσβύτεροι*), seems here to be equally pointed out.

But though this supposition has so much plausibility,

yet the evidence for it, on closer examination, appears by no means conclusive. It is far from clear that in the last quoted passage of the Acts, the narrative alludes to persons holding a distinct office in the church,* it may very naturally be understood of the younger members who were fitted for such manual employment, without any other eligibility than the fact of their age and bodily strength. And, therefore, we are not to suppose that a contrast is intended between the servants and ruling Elders of the church, but simply between the younger and older members. As to the Grecian names of the seven deacons, it cannot be inferred with certainty from this circumstance that they all belonged to the Hellenists, for it is well known that the Jews often bore double names, one Hebrew or Aramaic, and the other Hellenistic. Still it is possible, since the complaints of the partial distribution of alms came from the Hellenistic part of the church, that, in order to infuse confidence and satisfaction, pure Hellenists were chosen on this occasion. But if these deacons were appointed only for the Hellenists, it

* Even after what has been urged by Meyer and Olshausen in their Commentaries on the Acts, against this view, I cannot give it up. In accordance with the relation in which, anciently, and especially among the Jews, the young stood to their elders, it would follow as a matter of course, that the young men in an assembly would be ready to perform any service which might be required. I do not see why (as Olshausen maintains), on that supposition, any other term than *παιδίσκοι* should have been used—for, if Luke had wished to designate appointed servants of the church, he would not have used this indefinite appellation;—nor can I feel the force of Olshausen's objection, that in that passage of the Acts, the article would not have been used, but the pronoun *οὗτοι*. Luke intended to mark, no doubt, a particular class of persons, the younger contradistinguished from the elder, without determining whether all or only some lent their assistance. But Olshausen is so far right, that if these are assumed to be regularly appointed servants of the church, they cannot be considered as the forerunners of the deacons chosen at a later period, for manifestly these *παιδίσκοι* held a far lower place. I am glad to find an acute advocate of the view I have taken in Rothe; see his work on the Commencement of the Christian Church, p. 162.

would have been most natural to entrust their election to the Hellenistic part alone, and not to the whole church.

Hence we are disposed to believe, that the church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them in relation to other believers; so that the whole arrangement and administration of the affairs of the church proceeded from them, and they were first induced by particular circumstances to appoint other church officers, as in the instance of deacons.

As in the government of the church in general, the apostles at first were the sole directors, all the contributions towards the common fund were deposited with them (Acts v. 2), and its distribution, according to the wants of individuals, was altogether in their hands. From Acts vi. 2, it cannot be positively inferred, that the apostles had not hitherto been occupied with this secular concern. That passage may be understood to intimate that they had hitherto attended to this business without being distracted in their calling as preachers of the Word, as long as the confidence universally reposed in them and the unity pervading the church, lightened this labour; but it assumed a very different aspect when a conflict of distinct interests arose between the members. Meanwhile, the number of the believers increased so greatly, that it is probable, had there been no other reason, that the apostles could not manage the distribution alone; but consigned a part of the business sometimes to one, sometimes to another, who either offered themselves for the purpose, or had shewn themselves to be worthy of such confidence. Still this department of labour had not yet received any regular form.

But as the visible church received into its bosom various elements, the opposition existing in these elements gradually became apparent, and threatened to destroy the Christian unity, until by the might of the Christian spirit this opposition could be counterbalanced, and a higher unity developed. The strongest opposition ex-

isting in the primitive church, was that between the Palestinian or purely Jewish, and the Hellenistic converts. And though the power of Christian love at first so fused together the dispositions of these two parties, that the contrariety seemed lost, yet the original difference soon made its appearance. It shewed itself in this respect, that the Hellenists, dissatisfied with the mode of distributing the alms, were mistrustful of the others, and believed that they had cause to complain that their own poor widows were not taken such good care of in the daily distribution*, as the widows of the Palestinian Jews; whether the fact was, that the apostles had hitherto committed this business to Palestinian Jews, and these had either justly or unjustly incurred the suspicion of partiality, or whether the want of a regular plan for this business had occasioned much irregularity and neglect of individuals, or whether the complaint was grounded more in the natural mistrust of the Hellenists than in a real grievance, must be left undetermined, from the want of more exact information. These complaints, however, induced the apostles to establish a regular plan for conducting this business, and since they could not themselves combine the strict oversight of individuals, and the satisfaction of each one's wants† with a proper attention to the principal object of their calling, they thought it best to institute a particular office for the purpose, the first regular one for administering the concerns of the church. Accordingly, they required the church to entrust this business to persons who enjoyed the general confidence, and were fitted for the office,

* Neither from the expression *διακονία*, vi. 1, nor from the phrase *διακονίᾳ ὑπηρεσίας*, can it be inferred with certainty that the apostles alluded only to the distribution of food among the poor widows. We may be allowed to suppose that this was only one of the Tables of the service they performed, and that it is mentioned to mark more pointedly the distinction between the oversight of spiritual, and that of secular concerns.

† That they were required to undertake the business alone, instead of entrusting it to deputies, cannot be proved from the language in the Acts.

animated by Christian zeal, and armed with Christian prudence.* Seven such individuals were chosen; the number being accidentally fixed upon as a common one, or being adapted to seven sections of the church. Thus this office originated in the immediate wants of the primitive church, and its special mode of operation was marked out by the peculiar situation of this first union of believers, which was in some points dissimilar to that of the Jewish synagogue, or of later Churches. As it was called for by the pressure of circumstances, it certainly was not intended to be perfectly correspondent to an office in the Jewish synagogue, and can by no means be considered parallel to that of a common servant of the Synagogue

(Luke iv. 20), termed שָׂרֵי צְבֹר, שָׂמֵשׁ, חֵזָן.†

It was of higher importance, for at first it was the only one in the church besides the apostolic, and required a special capability in the management of men's dispositions, which might be employed in services of a higher kind, and was such as without doubt belonged to the general idea of σοφία. Neither was this office altogether identical with that which at a later period bore the same name,‡ but was subordinate to the office of presbyters. And yet it would be wrong to deny that the later church office of this name developed itself from the first, and might be traced back to it.‖ Although, as is usual in such affairs, when the ecclesiastical system became more complex, many changes took place in the office of dea-

* Acts vi. 3. The word πρῶτον (which is the true reading, for αἰγιον and κυριον appear to be only glosses) denotes that inspiration for the cause of the gospel which is requisite for every kind of exertion for the kingdom of God; σοφία signifies, that quality which is essential for this office in particular, and imports in the New Testament, wisdom or prudence.

† See Rothe's admirable Remarks, p. 166.

‡ As Chrysostom observes in his fourteenth Homily on the Acts, § 3.

‖ As the Second Trullanian Council, c. 16, which was occasioned by a special object, that the number of deacons for large towns might not be limited to seven.

cons; for example, the original sole appointment of deacons for the distribution of alms, became afterwards subordinate to the influence of the presbyters, who assumed the whole management of church affairs,* and though many other secular employments were added to the original one, yet the fundamental principle as well as the name of the office remained.† In later times, we still find traces of the distribution of alms being considered as the peculiar employment of deacons.‡ Here, as in many other instances in the history of the church, human weakness and imperfection subserved the divine wisdom, and promoted the interests of the kingdom of God; for by this appointment of deacons for the Hellenistic part of the church, distinguished men of Hellenistic descent and education were brought into the public service of the church, and the Hellenists, by their freer mental culture, were in many respects better qualified

* From Acts xi. 30, nothing more is to be inferred, than that when presbyters were appointed for the general superintendence of the church, the contributions intended for the church were handed over to them, as formerly to the apostles, when they held the exclusive management of affairs. It may be fairly supposed that the presbyters entrusted each of the deacons with a sum out of the common fund for distribution in his own department.

† I find no reason (with Rothe, p. 166) to doubt this; for the name was well adapted to denote their particular employment, and to distinguish them from persons acting in a more subordinate capacity, as *ἐπίσκοποι*. Nor is it any objection to this, that in Acts xxi. 8, they are merely called *The Seven*, for as the name of deacon was then the usual appellation of a certain class of officers in the church, Luke uses this expression to distinguish them from others of the same name, just as *the twelve* denoted the apostles.

‡ Hence, at the appointment of deacons, it was required, that they should "not be greedy of filthy lucre," 1 Timothy iii. 8. Origen, in Matt. t. xvi. § 22, *οἱ διακονοὶ διακονῶντες τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας χρήματα*; and Cyprian says of the deacon Felicissimus, *pecuniæ commissæ sibi fraudator*. Even in the apostolic age, the deacons' office appears to have extended to many other outward employments, and most probably the word *ἀντιλήψεις*, 'Helps,' denotes the serviceableness of their office. 1 Cor. xii. 28.

rightly to understand and to publish the gospel as the foundation of a method of salvation independent of Judaism, and intended for all men equally without distinction. The important consequences resulting from this event, will appear in the course of the history.

The institution of the office of Presbyters was similar in its origin to that of deacons. As the church was continually increasing in size, the details of its management also multiplied; the guidance of all its affairs by the apostles could no longer be conveniently combined with the exercise of their peculiar apostolic functions; they also wished, in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, not to govern alone, but preferred that the body of believers should govern themselves under their guidance; thus they divided the government of the church, which hitherto they had exercised alone, with tried men, who formed a presiding council of Elders, similar to that which was known in the Jewish Synagogues under the title of ἐκκλησία, πρεσβύτεροι.^{*} Possibly, as the formal appoint-

^{*} Bauer has lately maintained, that the general government of the affairs of the church did not enter originally and essentially into the idea of πρεσβύτεροι, but that originally every πρεσβύτερος presided over a small distinct Christian society. From this, one consequence would follow, which Bauer also deduces from it, that not a *republican*, but a *monarchical* element entered originally into the constitution of the church, a position from which most important consequences would follow. But against this assertion, we have many things to urge. Since the appointment of presbyters in the Christian church entirely corresponded with that of presbyters in the Jewish synagogue, at least in their original constitution, so we may conclude, that if a plurality of elders stood at the head of the synagogue, the same was the case with the first Christian church. But as the synagogue according to the ancient Jewish constitution, was organized on the plan of the great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, we might expect that a whole college of elders would have the direction of the Synagogues, as such a college of elders was really at the head of the Jews in a city. Luke vii. 3. The passages in which one is distinguished by the title of ἐκκλησιαρχος, Luke viii. 41, 49, xiii. 14, may signify, that the individual mentioned stood at

ment of deacons arose from a specific outward occasion, a similar, though to us unknown, event occasioned that of Presbyters. They were originally chosen as in the Synagogue, not so much for the instruction and edification of the church, as for taking the lead in its general government.

But as to the provision made in the primitive church for religious instruction and edification, we have no precise information. If we are justified in assuming that the mode adopted in the assemblies of Gentile Christians, which in accordance with the enlightened spirit

the head of the Jewish congregation as **רֹאשׁ הַכְּנֶסֶת**, and that the form of government was rather monarchical. But admitting this, still the supposition of a college of presbyters, presiding over the synagogue, would not be invalidated, since we meet with a plurality of **ἐκκλησιαστικοί** = *episcopoi*, Acts xiii. 15; xviii. 8-18. Yet we must make the limitation, that in smaller places an individual, as in larger towns a plurality, stood at the head of the synagogue. It is most probable, that although all presbyters were called **ἐκκλησιαστικοί**, yet one who acted as president was distinguished by the title of **ἐκκλησιαστικός**, as *primus inter pares*. In evidence of this, compare the first passage quoted from Luke with Mark v. 22. This is important in reference to the later relation of bishops to presbyters. The analogy to the Jewish synagogue allows us to conclude, that at the head of the first church at Jerusalem, a general deliberative college was placed from the beginning, a notion which is favoured by a comparison with the college of apostles; and in the Acts, a plurality of presbyters always appears next in rank to the apostles, as representatives of the church at Jerusalem. If any one is disposed to maintain, that each of these presbyters presided over a smaller part of the church at its special meetings, still it must be thereby established, that notwithstanding these divided meetings, the church formed a whole, over which this deliberative college of presbyters presided, and therefore, the form of government was still republican. But if it is probable that the whole church, which could not meet in one place, divided itself into several companies, still the assumption, that from the beginning the number of presbyters was equal to the number of places of assembling, and to these subdivisions of the collective body of believers, is entirely groundless, and in the highest degree improbable.

and nature of Christianity, was not confined to one station of life, or to one form of mental cultivation—was also the original one, we might from *that* conclude, that from the first, any one who had the ability and an inward call to utter his thoughts on Christian topics in a public assembly, was permitted to speak for the general improvement and edification.* But the first church differed from the churches subsequently formed among the Gentiles in one important respect, that in the latter there were no teachers of that degree of illumination, and claiming that respect to which the apostles had a right, from the position in which Christ himself had placed them. Meanwhile, though the apostles principally attended to the advancement of Christian knowledge, and as teachers possessed a preponderating and distinguished influence, it by no means follows, that they monopolized the right of instructing the church. In proportion as they were influenced by the spirit of the Gospel, it must have been their aim to lead believers by their teaching to that spiritual maturity, which would enable them to contribute (by virtue of the divine life communicated to all by the Holy Spirit) to their mutual awakening, instruction, and improvement. Viewing the occurrences of the day of Pentecost as an illustration of the agency of the Divine Spirit in the new dispensation, we might conclude that, on subsequent occasions, that spiritual excitement which impelled believers to testify of the divine life, could not be confined to the apostles. Accordingly, we find that individuals came forward, who had already devoted themselves to the study and interpretation of the Old Testament, and to meditation on divine things; and when, by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, they had become familiar with the nature of the gospel,

* That in the Jewish Christian churches, public speaking in their assemblies was not confined to certain authorized persons, is evident from the fact, that James, in addressing believers of that class who were too apt to substitute talking for practising, censured them, because so many without an inward call, prompted by self-conceit, put themselves forwards in their assemblies as teachers.

they could with comparative ease develope and apply its truths in public addresses. They received the gift for which there was an adaptation in their minds—the *χάρισμα διδασκαλίας*, and, in consequence of it, were inferior only to the apostles in aptitude for giving public instruction. Besides that connected intellectual development of truth, there were also addresses, which proceeded not so much from an aptness of the understanding improved by exercise, and acting with a certain uniformity of operation—as from an instantaneous, immediate, inward awakening by the power of the Holy Spirit, in which a divine afflatus was felt both by the speaker and hearers; to this class, belonged the *προφηταί*, the *χάρισμα προφητείας*. To the prophets also were ascribed the exhortations (*παρηκλήσεις*), which struck with the force of instantaneous impression on the minds of the hearers.* The *διδάσκαλοι* might also possess the gift of *προφητεία*, but not all who uttered particular instantaneous exhortations as prophets in the church, were capable of holding the office of *διδάσκαλοι*.† We have no precise information concerning the relation of the *διδάσκαλοι* to the presbyters in the primitive church, whether in the appointment of presbyters, care was taken that only those who were furnished with the gift of teaching should be admitted into the college of presbyters. Yet, in all cases, the oversight of the propagation of the Christian faith—the administration of teaching and of devotional exercises in the social meetings of believers, belonged to that general superintendence of the church which was entrusted to them, as in the Jewish synagogues; although it was not the special and exclusive office of the elders

* The Levite Joses, who distinguished himself by his powerful addresses in the church, was reckoned among the prophets, and hence was called by the apostles *בִּרְבִּינָה*, *Βαρναβας*, and this is translated in the Acts (iv. 36) *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως* = *υἱὸς προφητείας*.

† In Acts xix. 6, as a manifestation of the spiritual gifts that followed conversion, *προφητεῖαι* is put next to *γλώσσαι λαλῶν*.

to give public exhortations, yet whoever might speak in their assemblies, they exercised an inspection over them. Acts. xiii. 15. In an epistle written towards the end of the apostolic era to an early church composed of Christians of Jewish descent in Palestine (the Epistle to the Hebrews), it is presupposed that the rulers of the church had from the first provided for the delivery of divine truth, and watched over the spiritual welfare of the church, and therefore had the care of souls.

Relative to the spread of Christianity among the Jews, the most remarkable feature is the gradual transition from Judaism to Christianity as a new independent creation, Christianity presenting itself as the crowning-point of Judaism in its consummation accomplished by the Messiah; the transfiguration and spiritualization of Judaism, the new, perfect law given by the Messiah as the fulfilling of the old; the new spirit of the higher life communicated by the Messiah, gradually developing itself in the old religious forms, to which it gave a real vitality. Such is that representation of Christianity which is given in the Sermon on the Mount. First of all, Peter appears before us, and then after he had passed over the limits of the old national theocracy to publish the gospel among the heathen, James presents himself as the representative of this first step in the development of Christianity in its most perfect form.

The transition from Judaism to Christianity in general gradually developed itself, beginning with the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah promised in the Old Testament; and hence many erroneous mixtures of the religious spirit prevalent among the Jews were formed with Christianity, in which the Jewish element predominated, and the Christian principle was depressed and hindered from distinctly unfolding itself. There were many to whom faith in the Messiahship of Jesus was added to their former religious views, only as an insulated outward fact, without developing a new principle in their inward life and disposition—baptized Jews who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, and expected his speedy return for the establishment of the Messianic

kingdom in a temporal form, as they were wont to represent it to themselves from their carnal Jewish standpoint; they received some new precepts from Him, as so many positive commands, without rightly understanding their sense and spirit, and were little distinguished in their lives from the common Jews. That Jesus faithfully observed the form of the Jewish law, was assumed by them as a proof that that form would always retain its value. They clung to the letter, the spirit was always a mystery: they could not understand in what sense he declared that he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. They adhered to *not destroying* it according to the letter, without understanding what this meant according to the spirit, since what was meant by *fulfilling* it was equally unknown to them. Such persons would easily fall away from the faith which had never been in them a truly living one, when they found that their carnal expectations were not fulfilled, as is implied in the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews. As the common Jewish spirit manifested itself to be a one-sided attachment to externals in religion, a cleaving to the letter and outward forms, without any development and appropriation of the spirit, a preference for the shell without the kernel; so it appeared in the Jews as an opponent to the reception of the gospel, and to the renovation of the heart by it, as an overvaluation of the outward observance of the law, whether in ceremonies or in a certain outward propriety, and an undue estimation of a merely historical faith, something external to the soul, consisting only in outward profession, either of faith in one God as creator and governor, or in Jesus as the Messiah, as if the essence of religion were placed in either one or the other, or as if a righteousness before God could be thereby obtained. The genius of the gospel presented itself in opposition to both kinds of *opus operatum* and dependence on works, as we shall see in the sequel. At first it was the element of Pharisaic Judaism, which mingled itself with, and disturbed the pure Christian truth; at a later period Christianity aroused the attention of those mystical or

theosophic tendencies, which had developed themselves in opposition to the Pharisaism cleaving rigidly to the letter, and a carnal Judaism, partly and more immediately as a reaction from the inward religious element and spirit of Judaism, partly under the influence of Oriental and Grecian mental tendencies, by which the unbending and rugged Judaism was weakened and modified; and from this quarter other erroneous mixtures with Christianity proceeded, which cramped and depressed the pure development of the Word and Spirit.

We shall now pass on from the first internal development of the Christian Church among the Jews to its outward condition.

CHAPTER III.

THE OUTWARD CONDITION OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH : ITS PERSECUTIONS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES.

It does not appear that the Pharisees, though they had taken the lead in the condemnation of Christ, were eager, after that event, to persecute his followers. They looked on the illiterate Galileans, as worthy of no further attention, especially since they strictly observed the ceremonial law, and at first abstained from controverting the peculiar tenets of their party; they allowed them to remain undisturbed, like some other sects by whom their own interests were not affected. Meanwhile, the church was enabled continually to enlarge itself. An increasing number were attracted and won by the overpowering energy of spiritual influence which was manifested in the primitive church; the apostles also by the miracles they wrought in the confidence and power of faith, first aroused the attention of carnal men, and then made use

of this impression to bring them to an acknowledgment of the divine power of Him in whose name such wonders were performed, and to hold him forth to them as the deliverer from all evil. Peter especially, possessed in an extraordinary degree that gift of faith which enabled him to perform cures, of which a remarkable example is recorded in the third chapter of the Acts.

When Peter and John at one of the usual hours of prayer, about three in the afternoon, were going into the Temple, they found at one of the gates of the Temple (whose precincts, as afterwards those of Christian churches, were a common resort of beggars) a man who had been lame from his birth. While he was looking for alms from them, Peter uttered the memorable words, which plainly testified the conscious possession of a divine power that could go far beyond the common powers of Man and of Nature; and which, pronounced with such confidence, carried the pledge of their fulfilment: "Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have, give I thee; in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk." When the man, who had been universally known as a lame beggar, was seen standing with joy by the side of his two benefactors, to whom he clung with overflowing gratitude, a crowd full of curiosity and astonishment collected around the apostles as they were leaving the Temple, and were ready to pay them homage as persons of peculiar sanctity. But Peter said to them, "Why do you look full of wonder on us as if we had done this by our own power and holiness? It is not our work, but the work of the Holy One whom ye rejected and delivered up to the Gentiles; whose death ye demanded, though a heathen judge wished to let him go, and felt compelled to acknowledge his innocence." We here meet with the charge which ever since the day of Pentecost, Peter had been used to bring forward, in order to lead the Jews to a consciousness of their guilt, to repentance, and to faith. "God himself has by subsequent events justified Him whom ye condemned, and proved your guilt. That God who was with our Fa-

thers, and revealed his presence by miraculous events, has now revealed himself by the glorification of Him whom ye condemned. Ye have put him to death, whom God destined thereto, to bestow on us a divine life of everlasting blessedness; but God raised him from the dead, and we are the eye-witnesses of his resurrection. The believing confidence implanted in our hearts by him, has effected this miracle before your eyes." Peter would have spoken in a different strain to obstinate unbelievers. But here he hoped to meet with minds open to conviction. He therefore avoided saying what would only exasperate and repel their feelings. After he had said what tended to convince them of their guilt, he adopted a milder tone, to infuse confidence and to revive the contrite. He brought forward what might be said in extenuation of those who had united in the condemnation of Christ, "That in ignorance they had denied the Messiah,"* and that as far as they and their rulers had acted in ignorance, it was in consequence of a higher necessity. It was the eternal counsel of God, that the Messiah should suffer for the salvation of men, as had been predicted by the Prophets. But now is the time for you to prove, that you have erred only through ignorance, if you now allow yourselves to be brought to a sense of your unrighteousness by the fact of which you are witnesses; if you now repent and believe in Jesus as the Messiah, and seek through him that forgiveness of your sins which he is ready to bestow. Thus only you can expect deliverance from all evil and full salvation; for he is now hidden from your bodily eyes, and, exalted to heaven, reveals himself as invisibly efficient by miracles, such as those you have witnessed; but when the time arrives for the completion of all things, that

* Peter by no means acquits them of all criminality, as the connection of his words with what he had before said plainly shews; for he had brought forward the example of Pilate to point out how great was the criminality of those who, even in their blindness, condemned Jesus; but ignorance may be more or less culpable, according to the difference of the persons.

great period to which all the prophecies of the Old Testament point from the beginning, then will he appear again on earth to effect that completion; for Moses* and the prophets have spoken beforehand of what is to be performed by the Messiah, as the consummation of all things. And you are the persons to whom these promises of the prophets will be fulfilled; to you belong the promises which God gave to your Fathers, the promise given to Abraham, that through his posterity all the families of the earth should be blessed.† As one day a blessing from this promised seed of Abraham shall extend to all the nations of the earth,‡ so shall it first be fulfilled to you, if you turn from your sins to him.

The commotion produced among the people who gathered round the apostles in the precincts of the Temple, at last aroused the attention and suspicion of the priests, whose office it was to perform the service in the Temple, and to preserve order there. The two apostles, with the cured cripple who kept close to them, were apprehended, and as it was now evening, too late for any judicial proceedings, were put in confinement till the next day.¶

* Peter here appeals to the passage in Deuteronomy xviii. 15, 18, where certainly, according to the connection, only the prophets in general, by whom God continually enlightened and guided his people, are contrasted with the false soothsayers and magicians of idoltrous nations. But yet, as the Messiah was the last of these promised prophets, to be followed by no other, in whom the whole prophetic system found its centre and consummation, so far this passage in its spirit may justly be applied to the Messiah; though we cannot affirm that Peter himself was distinctly aware of the difference between the right interpretation of the letter, according to grammatical and logical rules, and its application in spirit, not arbitrary indeed, but grounded on an historical necessity.

† This promise, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18, according to its highest relation, which must be found in the organic development of the kingdom of God, is fulfilled by the Messiah.

‡ On the sense in which, at that time, Peter understood this, see above.

¶ Gfrörer imagines that he can shew that this narrative

When brought before the Sanhedrim, Peter, full of holy inspiration, and raised by it above the fear of man, testi-

was only a legendary echo of the accounts in the Gospels, a transference of the miracles of Christ to the apostles, and often applies this mode of interpretation to the first part of the Acts. Thus he maintains, that the words in Acts iv. 7, "By what power and by what name have ye done this?" are copied from the question addressed to Christ, Luke xx. 2: "Tell us by what authority thou doest these things?" and that this is proved to be a false transference, because the question stands in its right place in the Gospel history, but not in the narrative of the Acts; "for, according to the Jewish notions, every one might cure diseases." But though the cure of a disease need not occasion any further inquiries, yet a cure, which appeared to be accomplished by supernatural power, might properly call forth the inquiry, Whence did he who performed it profess to receive the power? As it was understood by Peter, the question involved an accusation that he professed to have received power for performing such things, through his connection with an individual who had been condemned by the Sanhedrim. This question was intended to call forth a confession of guilt. Equally groundless is Gfrörer's supposition, that the quotation in Acts iv. 11, "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders," refers to Matt. xxi. 42, and can only be understood by such a reference. The connection of the passage is sufficiently explicit, and is as follows: "If ye call us to account for the testimony we bear to Jesus as the Messiah, ye will verify what was predicted in that passage of the Psalms. The Jesus of Nazareth condemned by the heads of the Jewish polity, is honoured by God to be made the foundation on which the whole kingdom of God rests. He has received from God the power by which we effect such miracles."

Gfrörer further remarks, that the plainest proof that this narrative is defective in historical truth lies in verse 16, "What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it;" he asserts that these persons could not have so expressed themselves. But if the author of this account has put in the mouth of the Sanhedrim, what he believed might be presumed to be the thoughts that influenced their conduct, can it on that account be reasonably inferred, that the narrative is in the main unhistorical? On the same plan by which Gfrörer thinks he can shew that such narratives in the Acts are only imitations of those

fied to the Rulers of the Jewish nation that only by the might of Him whom they had crucified, but whom God had raised from the dead, it had come to pass, that they beheld this man standing in perfect soundness before them. He was the stone despised by the builders, those who wished to be the leaders of God's people, who would become the foundation on which the whole building of God's kingdom would rest. Psalm cxviii. 22. There was no other means of obtaining salvation, but faith in him alone. The members of the Sanhedrim were astonished to hear men, who had not been educated in the Jewish schools, and whom they despised as illiterate, speak with such confidence and power, and they knew not what to make of the undeniable fact, the cure of the lame man; but their prejudices and spiritual pride would not allow them to investigate more closely the cause of the fact which had taken place before their eyes. They only wished to suppress the excitement which the event had occasioned, for they could not charge any false doctrine on the apostles, who taught a strict observance of the law. Perhaps also the secret though not altogether decided friends, whom the cause of Christ had from the first among the members of the Sanhedrim, exerted an influence in favour of the accused. The schism likewise between the Pharisaic and the Sadducean parties in the Sanhedrim, might have a favourable influence on the conduct of that assembly towards the Christians. The Sadducees, who were exasperated with the apostles for so zealously advocating the doctrine of the resurrection, and who were the chief authors of the machinations against them at this time, were yet so far obliged to yield to the prevalent popular belief, as not to venture to allege that against the disciples which most excited their enmity. Hence, without making any specific charge against the apostles, they satisfied themselves with imposing silence upon them by a peremptory mandate; which, according to the existing ecclesiastical con-

in the Gospels, we might easily nullify much in later history, as merely legendary copies of earlier history.

stitution of the Jews, the Sanhedrim was competent to issue, being the highest tribunal in matters of faith, without whose sanction no one could be acknowledged as having a divine commission. The apostles protested that they could not comply with a human injunction, if it was at variance with the laws of God, and that they could not be silent respecting what they had seen and heard; the Sanhedrim, however, repeated the prohibition, and added threats of punishment in case of disobedience.

Meanwhile this miracle, so publicly wrought—the force of Peter's address—and the vain attempt to silence him by threats, had the effect of increasing the number of Christian professors to about two thousand. As the apostles, without giving themselves any concern about the injunction of the Sanhedrim, laboured according to the intention they had publicly avowed, both by word and deed, for the spread of the Gospel, it is not surprising that they were soon brought again before the Sanhedrim as contumacious. When the president reproached them for their disobedience, Peter renewed his former protestation. "We must obey God rather than man. And the God of our Fathers (he proceeded to say) is he who has called us to testify of what ye have forbidden us to speak. By his omnipotence, he has raised that Jesus whom ye crucified, and has exalted him to be the leader and redeemer of his people, that through him all may be called to repentance, and receive from him the forgiveness of their sins. This we testify, and this the Holy Spirit testifies in the hearts of those who believe on him."* These words of Peter at once aroused the

* These words (Acts v. 32) are by many understood, as if by the term *μαρτυροῦντες* the apostles were intended, and as if the sense of the passage were this: We testify of these things, as the eye-witnesses chosen by Him; and the Holy Spirit, in whose power we have performed this cure, testifies by the works which we accomplish in his name. Such an interpretation is certainly possible. But it is more natural, as we apply the first clause to the apostles, to apply the second to those who received their message in faith, and to whom the truth of this message was verified, independently of their hu-

wrath of the Sadducees and Fanatics, and many of them were clamorous for putting the apostles to death; but amidst the throng of infuriated zealots, *one* voice of temperate wisdom might be heard. Gamaliel, one of the seven most distinguished teachers of the Law (the Rabbanim), thus addressed the members of the Sanhedrim; "Consider well what ye do to these men. Many founders of sects and party-leaders have appeared in our day; they have at first acquired great notoriety, but in a short time they and their cause have come to nothing." He proved his assertion by several examples of commotions and insurrections which happened about that period among the Jews.* They might safely leave this affair also to itself. If of human origin, it would speedily come to an end; but if it should be something divine, vain would be the attempt to put it down by human power, and let them see to it, that they were not guilty of rebellion against God.

man testimony, by the divine witness of the Holy Spirit, in their hearts; to whom the Holy Spirit himself gave a pledge, that, by faith in Jesus, they had received forgiveness of sins and a divine life. This interpretation is also to be preferred, because Peter, after the day of Pentecost, was always wont to appeal to that objective testimony which the Holy Spirit produced in all believers. If the first interpretation were correct, the emphasis would lie on *ἡμῖν*—*we*, and the Holy Spirit by us; indeed, the last clause should have been *ἡμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*.

* The mention of Theudas in Gamaliel's speech, occasions, as is well known, a great difficulty, since his insurrection seems as if it could be no other than that mentioned by Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 5, 1; but to admit this would involve an anachronism. It is very possible that, at different times, two persons named Theudas raised a sedition among the Jews, as the name was by no means uncommon. Origen (against Celsus, i. 57) mentions a Theudas before the birth of Christ, but his testimony is not of great weight, for perhaps he fixed the time by the account in the Acts. It is also possible that Luke, in the relation of the event which he had before him, found the example of Theudas adduced as something analogous, or that one name has happened to be substituted for another. In either case it is of little importance.

Too much has been attributed to these words of Gamaliel, when it has been inferred from them, that he was a secret adherent of the Gospel; * the connection he kept up with the Jewish schools of theology precludes such a supposition. By the traditions of the Gemara we are justified in considering him as one of the freethinking Jewish theologians, which we also learn from his being in favour of the cultivation of Grecian literature; † and from his peculiar mental constitution, we might likewise infer, that he could be more easily moved by an impression of the divine, even in appearances which did not bear the stamp of his party. But many of his expressions which are preserved in the Mishna, mark him plainly enough to have been a strict Pharisee, such as he is described by his pupil Paul; the great respect, too, in which he has ever been held by the Jews is a sufficient proof that they never doubted the soundness of his creed, that he could not be accused of any suspicious connection with the heretical sect. On the one hand, he had a clear perception of the fact, that all fanatical movements are generally rendered more violent by opposition, and that what in itself is insignificant, is often raised into importance by forcible attempts to suppress it. On the other hand, the manner in which the apostles spoke and acted made some impression on a man not wholly prejudiced; while their exact observance of the law, and hostile attitude towards Sadduceeism, must have disposed him more strongly in their favour, and hence the thought might arise in his mind, that after all there was something divine in the cause they advocated. His counsel prevailed; no heavier punishment than scourging was inflicted on the apostles for their disobedience, and they were dismissed after the former prohibition had been repeated.

* In the Clementines, i. 65, on the principle of *fraus pia*, it is supposed that, by the advice of the apostles, he remained a member of the Sanhedrim, and concealed his real faith in order to act for the advantage of the Christians, and to give them secret informations of all the designs formed against them.

† See Jost's History of the Israelites, vol. iii. p. 170.

Up to this time, the members of the new sect being strict observers of the law, and agreeing with the Pharisees in their opposition to the Sadducees, appeared in a favourable light to at least the moderate of the former.* But this amicable relation was at an end as soon as they came, or threatened to come, into open conflict with the principles of Pharisaism itself; when the spirit of the new doctrine was more distinctly felt in that quarter, an effect produced by an individual memorable on this account in the early annals of Christianity, the proto-martyr Stephen.

The deacons, as we have already remarked, were primarily appointed for a secular object, but in the discharge of their special duty frequently came in contact with home and foreign Jews; and since men had been chosen for this office who were full of Christian zeal, full of Christian faith, and full of Christian wisdom and prudence, they possessed both the inward call, and the ability to make use of these numerous opportunities for the spread of the Gospel among the Jews. In these attempts, Stephen particularly distinguished himself. As a man of Hellenistic descent and education, he was better fitted than a native of Palestine for entering into the views of those foreign Jews who had synagogues for their exclusive use at Jerusalem, and thus leading them to receive the Gospel. The Holy Spirit, who hitherto had employed as instruments for the spread of the gospel only Palestinian Jews, now fitted for his service an individual of very different mental training, the Hellenistic Stephen; and the result of this choice was very important. Although the Holy Spirit alone, according to the Saviour's promise, could lead the apostles to a clear perception of the contents of the whole truth † announced by himself; yet the quicker

* See Schneckenburger's Essay in his "*Beiträgen zur Einleitung in's Neue Testament*," p. 87.

† Christ did not promise the apostles indefinitely that the Holy Spirit should guide them into all things, but into the whole of the truth, which he came to announce for the salvation of mankind; John xvi. 13.

or slower development of this perception, was in many respects dependent on the mental peculiarity, and the special standing-point of general and religious culture of the individuals who were thus to be enlightened by the Holy Spirit. In one individual, the development of Christian knowledge was prepared for by his previous standing-point; and hence under the influence of the Holy Spirit, a knowledge (*γινωσις*) of Christian truth rapidly developed itself from faith (*πιστις*); whereas, for another to attain the same insight, the bounds which confined his previous standing-point must be first broken down by the power of the Holy Spirit operating in a more immediate manner, by a new additional revelation (*ἀποκαλύψις*). When Christ spoke to his apostles of certain things which they could not yet comprehend, but which must be first revealed to them by the Holy Spirit, he, no doubt, referred to the essence of religion, to that worshipping of God in spirit and in truth, which is not necessarily confined to place or time, or to any kind whatever of outward observances; and with which the abolition of the Mosaic ceremonial law (that wall of separation between the chosen people of God and other nations, Ephes. ii. 14), and the union of all nations in one spiritual worship and one faith—were closely connected. The apostles had by this time understood, through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the nature of the spiritual worship founded on faith, but the consequences flowing from it in relation to outward Judaism they had not yet clearly apprehended. In this respect, their standing-point resembled Luther's—after he had attained a living faith in justification, in reference to outward Catholicism, ere he had by the further maturing of his Christian knowledge, abjured that also—and that of many who before and since the Reformation have attained to vital Christianity, though still to a degree enthralled in the fetters of Catholicism. Thus the apostles first attained to a full development of their Christian knowledge, to a clear perception of the truth on this side, when by the power of the Holy Spirit they were freed from the fetters of their strictly Jewish train-

ing, which obscured this perception. On the other hand, the Hellenistic Stephen needed not to attain this mental freedom by a new immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, for he was already, by his early development in Hellenistic culture, more free from these fetters, he was not so much entangled in Jewish nationality, and hence his Christian knowledge could on this side more easily and quickly attain to clearness of perception. In short, Stephen was the forerunner of the great Paul, in his perception of Christian truth and testimony he bore to it, as well as in his conflict for it with the carnal Jews, who obstinately adhered to their ancient standing-point. It is highly probable, that he was first induced by his disputations with the Hellenists, to present the Gospel on the side of its opposition to the Mosaic law; to combat the belief in the necessity of that law for the justification and sanctification of men, and, what was connected therewith, its perpetual obligation, and then to shew that the new spirit of the gospel freed it altogether from the outward forms of Judaism; that the new spirit of religion required an entirely new form. As agreeably to the prophecy of Christ, the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem, with which the Jews had hitherto considered the worship of God as necessarily and essentially connected, was now about to take place by means of the divine judgments on the degenerate earthly kingdom of God, through the victorious divine power of the Messiah, exalted to the right hand of his heavenly Father—so would the whole outward system of Judaism fall with this its only earthly sanctuary, and the theocracy arise glorified and spiritualized from its earthly trammels. We cannot determine with confidence, to what extent Stephen, in his disputations with the Jews, developed all this, but we may infer with certainty from the consequences, that it would be more or less explicitly stated by this enlightened man. Hence it came to pass, that the rage of the Pharisees was now excited, as it had never yet been against the promulgators of the new doctrine; hence an accusation such as had never yet been brought against them—that Stephen had uttered blas-

phemous words against Jehovah and against Moses. We are told, indeed, that *false* witnesses deposed against him that he ceased not to speak against the Holy City (the Temple) and the Law—that he had declared that Jesus of Nazareth would destroy the Temple, and abrogate the usages handed down from Moses. But although these accusations are represented as the depositions of *false* witnesses, it does not follow, that all that they said was a fabrication, but only that they had, on many points, distorted the assertions of Stephen, with an evil intention. They accused him of attacking the divine origin and holiness of the law, and of blaspheming Moses; all which was very far from his design. Yet he must, by what he said, have given them some ground for their misrepresentations, for before this time, nothing similar had been brought against the publishers of the gospel; hence we may make use of their allegations to find out what Stephen really said. And his defence plainly indicates that he by no means intended to repel that accusation as altogether a falsity, but rather to acknowledge that there was truth mixed up with it; that what he had really spoken, and what was already so obnoxious to the Jews, he had no wish to deny, but only to develope and establish it in its right connection. And thus we gain the true point of view for understanding this memorable and often misunderstood speech.

Stephen was seized by his embittered enemies, brought before the Sanhedrim, and accused of blasphemy. But though the minds of his judges were so deeply prejudiced by the reports spread against him, and they waited with intense eagerness to see the man who had uttered such unheard of things—when he actually came before them, and began to speak, they were struck with the commanding expression of his whole figure, with the inspired confidence—the heavenly repose and serenity which beamed in all his features. In the Acts we are told, that he stood before them with a glorified countenance, “as it were the face of an angel;” and it is very probable, that many members of the Sanhedrim had thus described the impression which his appearance made upon them. The

topics and arrangement of his discourse were suited to confirm this impression, and to turn it to good account, to fix the attention of his judges, and to put their minds in a more favourable position towards the speaker, thus gradually preparing them for that which he wished to make the main subject of his discourse. That discourse perfectly corresponds with the leading qualities ascribed to his character in the Acts. In his frank manner of expressing what he had learnt by the light of divine spirit, we recognise the man full of the power of faith, without the fear of man, or deference to human opinion; in his manner of constantly keeping one end in view, and yet, instead of abruptly urging it, gradually preparing his hearers for it, we recognise the man full of Christian prudence.

The object of Stephen's discourse was not simple but complex; yet it was so constructed, that the different topics were linked together in the closest manner. Its primary object was certainly apologetical, but as he forgot himself in the subject with which he was inspired, his apologetic efforts relate to the truths maintained by him, and impugned by his adversaries, rather than to himself; hence, not satisfied with defending, he developed and enforced the truths he had proclaimed; and at the same time, condemned the carnal ungodly temper of the Jews, which was little disposed to receive the truth. Thus with the apologetic element, the didactic and polemic were combined. Stephen first refutes the charges made against him of enmity against the people of God, of contempt of their sacred institutions, and of blaspheming Moses. He traces the procedure of the divine providence, in guiding the people of God from the times of their progenitors; he notices the promises and their progressive fulfilment, to the end of all the promises, the end of the whole development of the theocracy—the advent of the Messiah, and the work to be accomplished by him. But with this narrative, he blends his charges against the Jewish nation. He shews that their ingratitude and unbelief proceeding from a carnal mind, became more flagrant in proportion as the promises were

fulfilled, or given with greater fulness; and their conduct in the various preceding periods of the development of God's kingdom, was a specimen of the disposition they now evinced towards the publication of the gospel.* The first promise which God made to the patriarchs, was that respecting the land which he would give to their posterity for a possession, where they were to worship him. In faith, the patriarchs went forth under the constant guidance of God himself, which, however, did not bring them to the fulfilment of the promise. This promise was brought to the eve of its accomplishment by Moses. His divine call, the miracles God wrought for him and by him, are especially brought forward, and likewise the conduct of the Jews while under his guidance, as unbelieving, ungrateful, and rebellious towards this highly accredited servant of God, through whom they had received such great benefits: and yet Moses was not the end of the divine revelation. His calling was to point to that prophet whom God would raise up after him, whom they were to obey like himself. The conduct of the Jews towards Moses is therefore a type of their conduct towards that last great prophet whom he announced and prefigured. The Jews gave themselves up to idolatry, when God first established among them by Moses a symbolical sanctuary for his worship. This sanctuary was in the strictest sense of divine origin. Moses superintended its erection according to the pattern shewn to him by God, in a symbolic higher manifestation.†

* In this species of polemical discussion, Stephen was a forerunner of Paul. De Wette justly notices, as a peculiarity of the Hebrew nation, that conscience was more alive among them than any other people; often, indeed, an evil conscience, the feeling of guilt, the feeling of the high office assigned to it which it cannot and will not relinquish, the feeling of a schism between knowledge (the law) and the will, so that sin accumulates and comes distinctly into view; Rom. v. 20. See "*Studien und Kritiken*, 1837, p. 1003. On this account, the history of the Hebrew nation is the type of the history of mankind, and of men in general.

† Stephen probably wished to intimate that, in order to

The sanctuary was a moveable one, till at last, Solomon was permitted to erect an abiding edifice for divine worship on a similar plan. With this historical survey, Stephen concludes his argument against the superstitious reverence for the temple felt by the carnally-minded Jews, their narrow-hearted sensuous tendency to confine the essence of religion to the temple-worship. Having expressed this in the words of the prophet Isaiah, it was a natural transition to speak of the essential nature of true spiritual worship, and of the prophets who in opposition to the stiff-necked, carnal dispositions of the Jews had testified concerning it, and the Messiah by whom it was to be established among the whole human race. A vast prospect now opened before him; but he could not complete the delineation of the august vision of the divine dispensations which was present to his imagination; while gazing at it, the emotions it excited carried him away; his holy indignation gushed forth in a torrent of rebuke, against the ungodly, unbelieving, hypocritical disposition of the Jews, whose conduct in reference to the divine communications had been the same from the time of Moses up to that very moment. "Ye stiff-necked, although boasting of your circumcision, yet who have never received the true circumcision. Ye uncircumcised in heart and ear (who want the disposition to feel and to understand what is divine), ye always withstand the workings of the Holy Ghost. Ye do as your fathers did. As your fathers murdered the prophets who predicted the appearance of the Holy One, so have ye yourselves given Him up to the Gentiles, and thus are become his murderers. Ye who boast of a law given by God through the ministry of angels,* (as organs of mak-

guard against idolatry, to which the Jews were so prone, it was necessary to confine the worship of God to a fixed visible sanctuary, and, on the other hand, which is an idea that pervades the Epistle to the Hebrews, that this sanctuary could not communicate the divine, but could only represent it in a figure.

* This was confessedly a frequent mode among the Jews of marking the superhuman origin of the law; so that, ac-

ing known the divine will), and yet are so little observant of this law!"

Till this rebuke was uttered, Stephen had been quietly heard. But as soon as they perceived the drift of his discourse, their blind zeal and spiritual pride were roused. He observed the symptoms of their rage, but instead of being terrified thereby, he looked up to heaven, full of believing confidence in the power of Him of whom he testified, and saw with a prophetic glance, in opposition to the machinations of men against the cause of God, the glorified Messiah, denied by these men, but exalted to heaven, armed with divine power, and about to conquer all who dared to oppose his kingdom. This prophetic view was presented to him in the form of a symbolic vision. As he looked up to heaven, it appeared to open before his eyes. In more than earthly splendour, there appeared to him a form of divine majesty; he beheld Christ (whose glorious image was probably present to him from actual early recollection) glorified and enthroned at the right hand of God. Already in spirit raised to heaven, he testified with full confidence of what he beheld. In all periods of the church, a blind zeal for adherence to the letter and ceremonial services has been wont to interpret a highly spiritual state which will not follow the rules of the reigning theological school, nor suffer it to be confined by ancient maxims, as mere fanaticism or blasphemy;* and so it was on this occasion. The members of the Sanhedrim stopped their ears, that they might not be defiled by his

cording to Josephus, Herod, in a speech to the Jewish army, made use of this universally acknowledged fact, that the Jews had received their law from God (*ὅτι ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μεθέρων*), in order to shew how holy the ambassadors sent to them must be, who filled the same office as that of the angels between God and men; *ἀγγέλου* = *πρεσβυς*, *πρεσβυς* Joseph. Antiq. xv. 5, 3.

* Thus, at the Council of Constance, it was condemned as a violation of ecclesiastical subordination, that Huss had dared to appeal to Christ.

supposed blasphemies. They threw themselves on Stephen, and dragged him out of the city, in order to stone him as a blasphemer. It was sentence and execution all at once; an act of violence without regular judicial examination; besides, that according to the existing laws, the Sanhedrim could decide only on disciplinary punishment, but was not allowed to execute a capital sentence, without the concurrence of the Roman governor. With the same confidence with which Stephen, amidst the rage and fury of his enemies, saw the Saviour of whom he testified, ruling victorious—with the same confidence he directed his eyes towards him in the prospect of death, and said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" And as he had only Him before his eyes, it was his Spirit which led him to adopt the Saviour's last words, thus making him a pattern in death, as he had been in life. He who, when carried away with holy zeal for the cause of God, had so emphatically censured the baseness of the Jews, now that their fury attacked his own person, prayed only for this, that their sins might be forgiven.

Thus we see in the death of Stephen the new development of Christian truth apparently stopped; he died a martyr, not only for the truth of the gospel in general, but in particular for this free and wider application of it, which began with him and seemed to expire with him. Yet from the beginning, it has been the law of the development of the Christian life, and will continue to be the same down to the last glorious result, which will consummate the whole with the final triumph over death—that out of death a new life comes forth, and martyrdom for the divine truth, both in its general and particular forms, prepares its victory. Such was the issue here. This first new development of evangelical truth was checked in the germ in order to shoot forth with greater vigour, and to a wider extent, in the person of Paul, and the martyrdom of Stephen was one step in the process. If this new development had been fully exhibited at this time, the other publishers of the gospel would have been found unprepared for it, and not yet capable of receiving it. But in the meantime, these per-

sons, by a variety of circumstances concurring in a natural way under the constant guidance of the Holy Spirit, were prepared for this deeper insight into the truth.

The martyrdom of Stephen was important in its direct effects for the spreading of the faith, since it might be expected that, under the immediate impression made by the sight of such a witness, and of such a death, many minds not altogether unsusceptible, nor altogether deluded by the power of error, would be led to the faith; but yet the indirect consequences were still more important, by which the third violent persecution was raised against the new church at Jerusalem. This persecution must have been more severe and extensive than the former; for by the manner in which Stephen entered into conflict with Pharisaism, he had roused to hostilities against the teachers of the new doctrine, the sect of the Pharisees, who had the most credit with the common people, and were powerful and active, and ready to leave no means untried to attain their object, whatever it might be. The persecution proceeding from this quarter would naturally mark as its special victims those who were colleagues in office with Stephen, as deacons, and who resembled him in their Hellenistic origin and education. It was, however, the occasion of spreading the gospel beyond the bounds of Jerusalem and Judea, and even among the Gentiles. With this progressive outward development of the gospel, was also connected its progressive inward development, the consciousness of the independence and intrinsic capability of Christianity as a doctrine destined without foreign aid to impart divine life and salvation to all men, among all nations without distinction. Here, then, we stand on the boundary-line of a new era, both of the outward and inward development of Christianity.

BOOK II.

THE FIRST SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY FROM THE CHURCH
AT JERUSALEM TO OTHER PARTS, AND ESPECIALLY
AMONG HEATHEN NATIONS.

SAMARIA, which had been a scene of Christ's personal ministry, was the first place out of Judea where the gospel was preached by his apostles. Though the people of this country received no part of the Old Testament as sacred excepting the Pentateuch, yet from this portion of the Scriptures they formed themselves to faith in a Messiah who was to come; on him they placed their hopes, as the personage who was to bring back all things to their right relations, and thus to be the universal Restorer. Political considerations did not here, as among the Jews, obstruct the right apprehension of the idea of the Messiah; an idea which was specially awakened among this people by feelings of mental and bodily misery, though they were deficient in that right understanding of it which could only be obtained from its progressive development in the Old Testament; nor could the deep feeling of the need of redemption and restoration be clearly developed among them. A lively but indefinite obscure excitement of the religious feeling, always exposes men to a variety of dangerous delusions. This was the case with the Samaritans. As at that time, in other parts of the East, a similar indefinite longing after a new communication from Heaven,—an ominous restlessness in the minds of men, such as generally precedes great changes in the history of mankind, was diffused abroad; so this indistinct anxiety did not fail to lead astray and to deceive many, who were not rightly prepared for it, while they adopted a false method of allaying it. A mixture of unconscious self-deception and intentional

falsehood moved certain Goëtz, who, with mystical ideas, proceeding from an amalgamation of Jewish, Oriental, and Grecian elements, boasted of a special connection with the invisible world; and by taking advantage of the unknown powers of Nature, and by various arts of conjuration, excited the astonishment of credulous people, and obtained credit for their boastful pretensions. Such persons found at that time an easy access to the Samaritans in their state of mental excitement. To this class of men belonged a Jewish or Samaritan Goëtz, named Simon, who, by his extraordinary magical powers, so fascinated the people, that they said he must be more than man, that he was the great Power which emanated from the invisible God, by which he brought forth the universe, now appearing on earth in a bodily form.*

The idea of such an Intelligence emanating from God, as proceeding from the first act of the divine self-revelation, the first link in the chain of developed life was spread abroad in various oriental-Alexandrian and Alexandrian-oriental forms. The idea also of the incarnation of higher intelligence generally, and of this intelligence in particular, was by no means foreign to the notions prevalent in those parts. We can hardly consider every thing of this kind as a mere copy of the Christian idea of the incarnation, or recognise in it a symptom of the transforming power which the new Christian spirit exercised over the intellectual world; for we find earlier

* Possibly the words of which this Goëtz made use, are contained in the apocryphal writings of the Simonians; see Jerome's Commentary on Matthew, ch. xxiv. "Ego sum sermo Dei (ὁ λόγος), ego sum speciosus, ego paraclitus," (according to Philo, the Logos Advocate, παρακλητος, ἱερευς, through the divine reason revealing itself in the phenomenal world (the *νοητὸν παραδειγμα τοῦ κόσμου*), forms the connection between God and the phenomena, what is defective in the latter is supplied. De Vita Mosis, i. iii. 673; De Migratione Abrahami, 406). Ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei (according to Philo the Logos is the *μεγαλεις παῶν τῶν δυναμειν τοῦ θεοῦ*). Still this is uncertain, for the sect of the Simonians might easily borrow these expressions, as they had borrowed other things, from Christianity, and attribute them to Simon.

traces of such ideas.* But the prevalence of such ideas proves nothing against the originality of Christianity, or of any of its particular doctrines. On the one hand, we dare not refuse to acknowledge what could already form itself from the germs already given in the Old Testament, which was the preparative covering of the New, or from its spirit and leading ideas, which were directed to Christ as the end of all the divine revelations. On the other hand, we must recollect, that as from the new creation effected by Christianity, a powerful excitement was caused both of kindred and hostile minds, so also a great excitement of these minds preceded the great crisis, unconsciously anticipating and yearning after it; a presentiment that there would be such a revelation of the spiritual world as had not yet been made relating to the destinies of the human race. And from a teleological point of view, we recognise Christianity as the final aim of Divine Wisdom in conducting the course of human development, when at this period we find the spiritual atmosphere pregnant with ideas, which served to prepare a more susceptible soil for Christianity and its leading doctrines, and to form a back-ground for giving relief to the exhibition of the divine transactions which it announced.

Philip the Deacon being compelled to leave Jerusalem by the persecution which ensued on Stephen's death, was induced to take refuge in Samaria. He came to a city of that country,† where Simon was universally esteemed,

* In a Jewish apocryphal writing, the *περσευχή* 'Ioudaï, the patriarch Jacob is represented as an incarnation of the highest spirit living in the presence of the divine Original Being, whose true divine name was 'Ισραήλ, ἀπὸ ἰσραὶ Σιου, the *πνευματικός πνεύμας* ζῶντος ζωνομένου ὑπὲρ Σιού, (similar expressions to those used by Philo respecting the Logos), who was begotten before all angels, ὁ ἐκ πρῶτον Σιού λυτουμενός πρῶτος. See Origen, t. ii. Joh. § 25.

† It is not quite clear that the city of Samaria is intended; for there is no reason, with some expositors of Acts viii. 5, to consider the genitive as the sign of apposition. As in the whole chapter, Samaria is the designation of the country, it is most natural to understand it so in this passage. In the

and looked upon with wonder and reverence as a supernatural being. When he saw the people so devoted to a destructive delusion, he felt impelled by his zeal for the cause of God and the salvation of men, to impart that to them which alone could give substantial relief to their spiritual necessities. But men in this situation were not yet susceptible of the spiritual power of truth; it was needful to pave a way to their hearts by preparatory impressions on the senses. As Philip, by the divine aid, performed things which Simon with all his magical arts could not effect, especially healing the sick (which he accomplished by prayer and calling on the name of Christ), he thus attracted the attention of men to Him in whose name and power he had effected such things for them, and in their sight; he then took occasion to discourse more fully of Him, his works, and the kingdom that he had established among men, and by degrees the divine power of truth laid hold of their hearts. When Simon saw his followers deserting him, and was himself astounded at the works performed by Philip, he thought it best to acknowledge a power so superior to his own. He therefore professed himself a disciple of Philip, and was baptized by him like the rest; but as the sequel proves, we cannot infer from this, that the publication of the gospel had made an impression on his heart; it seems most probable that he secretly interpreted what had occurred according to his own views. The miracles performed by Philip had led him to the conviction, that he was in league with some superhuman spirit; he looked on baptism as an initiation into the compact, and hoped that, by forming such a compact, he might obtain an interest in such higher power, and use it for his own ends; he wished, in short, to combine the new magic or theurgy with his own. As we have already remarked, it was a standing regulation in primitive times, that all those who professed to believe the announcement of Jesus as the

14th verse, by Samaria is certainly meant the country, and yet it does not follow that absolutely the whole land had received the gospel.

Messiah should be baptized. And when Simon renounced his magical arts, which were now quite out of repute, there was no ground for rejecting him.

The information that despised Samaria was the first province out of Judea where the gospel found acceptance, caused great surprise among the Christians at Jerusalem. As the ancient prejudice against the Samaritans had not quite worn away, and no account had been received that, among the baptized believers, those wonderful works were manifested which, since the day of Pentecost, were considered as necessary concomitants of a reception into the Christian communion, the apostles Peter and John were sent thither to investigate what had transpired, and, by virtue of their apostolic calling, to complete whatever might be wanting for the establishment of a Christian community. We find, in the narrative of the Acts, no reason to impute the want of these operations of the Divine Spirit among the Samaritans in any degree to Philip's being only a deacon, as if he could not found a Christian society, and by preaching the gospel, and by prayer in the name of Christ, produce effects similar to those wrought by the apostles. But as in the reverse case, namely, the conversion of Cornelius, when the effects that commonly followed baptism then followed the preaching of the word, and preceded baptism, there was an internal reason for the order observed; a longer prepared susceptibility of disposition promoted the more rapid operations of living faith; so we naturally seek an internal reason for a different procedure among the Samaritans. The effects to which we refer proceeded from the power of a living consciousness of redemption obtained, and at the commencement of the new spiritual creation were a mark of vital Christianity. If all were not influenced in an equal degree, yet all were to a certain extent moved by the power of the Divine, and susceptible enough to be vitally aroused and borne along by the impression of that Christian inspiration which they saw before them, for the germ with which these manifestations of the Spirit connected themselves already existed in their bosoms. It was, in a spiritual respect, as when

a flame once broken forth, detects and kindles all the inflammable materials in its neighbourhood. But among these Samaritans, the feeling of their religious and moral necessities, which living faith in the Redeemer presupposes and unites with, was not yet awakened, in consequence of their being drawn aside and disturbed by the influence of Simon. At first, they believed the declarations of Philip as they had believed in the magical illusions of Simon, since these gross sensible miracles demanded their belief. Those who had thus attained to faith, were still entirely dependent on the person of Philip as a worker of miracles. They had not yet attained the consciousness of a vital communion with the Christ whom Philip preached, nor yet to the consciousness of a personal divine life. The indwelling of the Spirit was as yet something foreign to them, known only by the wonderful operations which they saw taking place around them. We have not a full account in the Acts of what was done by Peter and John, but simply the general results. No doubt these apostles carried on the work of Philip by preaching and prayer. After such a preparation, the believers were assembled, and the apostles prayed that Christ might glorify himself in them, as in all believers, by marks of the communication of divine life, employing the usual sign of Christian consecration, the laying on of hands. Manifestations now followed similar to those on the day of Pentecost, and the believers were thus recognised and attested to be a Christian church, standing in an equal rank with the first church at Jerusalem. But Simon was naturally incapable of understanding the spiritual connection of these manifestations; he saw in all of them merely the workings of magical forms and charms, a magic differing not in nature but only in degree from what he practised himself. Hence he imagined, that the apostles might communicate these magical powers to him also, by virtue of which all those on whom he laid hands would become filled with divine power, and with this view he offered them money. Peter spurned this proposal with detestation, and now first saw in its true light the real character of Simon,

who, in joining himself to believers, had pretended to be what he was not. Peter's terrible rebuke presents him to us as a faithful preacher of the gospel, insisting most impressively on the supreme importance of *disposition* in every thing which is imparted by Christianity in direct opposition to the art of magic, which disregards the necessary connection of the divine and supernatural with the disposition of the heart, drags them down into the circle of the natural, and attempts to appropriate to itself divine power by means of something else than that which is allied to it in human nature, and the only possible point of connection for it.* These were Peter's words: "Thy gold, with which thou attemptest to traffic in impiety, perish with thee. Do not deceive thyself, as if with this disposition thou couldst have any part in what is promised to believers. Thou hast no share in this matter,† for God, who sees what is within, is not deceived

* The poetical fancies of Christian antiquity, which make Peter the representative of the principle of simple faith in revelation, and Simon the representative of the magical and theosophic tendency in the human mind, have important truths for their basis.

† I cannot agree with those who understand *λογος* (Acts viii. 21) in the sense of the Hebrew *דָּבָר* = *'ēmu*, and suppose that Peter only told Simon that he could have no share in that thing, in that higher power which he hankered after. In this general sense, *'ēmu* is indeed used in the New Testament, but not the more definite term *λογος*. And according to this interpretation, Peter would say less than the context requires; for looking at the connection of v. 21 with 20 and 22, it is plain, he did not merely say, that Simon with such a disposition was excluded from participating in this higher power, but also from the kingdom of God, and thereby bring condemnation on himself. Hence we understand the word *λογος* in the common New Testament meaning of the divine doctrine—"the doctrine or truth announced by us"—at the same time including *συνάδοιχαίς*, all that a person would be authorised to receive by the appropriation of this doctrine. I am not convinced by what Meyer in his commentary urges against this interpretation, that it is at variance with the connection, in which there is no mention made of the doctrine. For in the mind of the speaker, the power of working miracles could

by thy hypocritical professions. Before his eyes thy intentions are manifest. With sincere repentance for such wickedness, pray to God that he would be pleased to forgive thee this wicked design." This rebuke made a great impression at the time on Simon's conscience, inclined more to superstition than to faith, and awakened a feeling not of repentance for the sinfulness of his disposition, but of apprehension of the divine vengeance. He entreated the apostles that they would pray to the Lord for him, that what they had threatened him with might not come to pass.

As is usual with such sudden impressions on the senses, the effect on Simon was only transient, for all the further notices we have of him shew that he soon returned to his former courses. About ten or twenty years later, we meet with a Simon in the company of Felix the Roman Procurator of Palestine, so strikingly resembling this man, that we are tempted to consider them as identical. The latter Simon* appears as a heartless magician,† to whom all persons, whatever their character, were welcome, provided they gave credit to his enchantments. With equal arrogance, he disclaimed all respect for the ancient

not be separated from the publication of the gospel and faith in it; and as Simon in the disposition of his mind was far from the gospel, and could stand in no sort of fellowship with it, it followed as a matter of course, that he could have no share in the ability to work such miracles.

* On the other hand, there is the difference of country, for the Simon to whom we refer, and whom Josephus mentions (*Antiq.* book xx, ch. vii. § 2), was a Jew from Cyprus; but Simon Magus, according to Justin Martyr, himself a native of Samaria, was born at a place called Gittim, in Samaria. Yet this evidence is not decisive, for a tradition so long after the time, though prevalent in the country where Simon made his appearance, might be erroneous. What has been said since I wrote the above, against the identity of the two Simons, is not demonstrative, though I willingly allow, that since the name of Simon was a very common one among the Jews, and such itinerant *γυνταί* were not seldom to be met with, the time also not perfectly agreeing, the identity must be left rather doubtful.

† *μάγος ὁμοῦ συνεπράξατος*, says Josephus.

forms of religion, and for the laws of morality. He was a confidant of the Roman Procurator Felix, and therefore could never have opposed his various inclinations, but on the contrary made his magic subservient to their gratification; he thus bound him more closely to himself, as a single example will shew. The immoral Felix had indulged a passion for Drusilla, sister of King Herod Agrippa, and wife of King Azizus of Emesa. Simon allowed himself to be the tool of Felix, for gratifying his unlawful desires. He persuaded Drusilla that by his superhuman power he could ensure great happiness for her, provided she married Felix, and managed to overcome her scruples of conscience against marrying a heathen. The character of this Simon is stamped on the theosophic gnostic sect of the Simonians, whose tenets were a mixture of the later Oriental, Jewish, Samaritan, and Grecian religious elements. The germ of their principles may be plainly traced back to this Simon, though we cannot attribute to him the complete system of this sect as it existed in the second century.

The two apostles returned again to Jerusalem, and as what they had witnessed convinced them of the susceptibility of the Samaritans for receiving the gospel, they availed themselves of the opportunity of publishing it in all the parts of the country through which they passed. But Philip extended his missionary journey farther, and became the instrument of bringing the first seeds of the gospel into Ethiopia (the kingdom of Candace at Meroe), though, as far as our knowledge of history goes,* without

* It is still a question whether the introduction of Christianity was not partially made before the mission of Frumentius on another side, and in a different part of Ethiopia; whether many things in the doctrine and usages of the present Abyssinian church, with which we have been better acquainted by means of Gobat's Journal, do not indicate a Jewish-Christian origin. If I am not mistaken, the late Rettig has brought forward these questions in the '*Studien und Kritiken*.' Perhaps intercourse with that ancient church will open to us some sources of information for answering them.

any important consequences. But, what is more deserving of notice, he published the gospel in the cities of Palestine, on the southern and northern coasts of the Mediterranean, till at last, probably after a considerable time, he settled at Cæsarea Stratonis, where on his arrival he found a Christian society already formed, which he built up in the faith.

Though the Christians of Jewish descent, who were driven by persecution from Jerusalem, were by that event induced to spread the gospel in Syria, and the neighbouring districts, yet their labours were confined to Jews. On the other hand, the Hellenists, such as Philip and others, who originally came from Cyprus and Cyrene, made their way among the Gentiles* also, to whom they were allied in language and education, which was not the case with the Jews. They presented them with the gospel independent of the Mosaic law, without attempting to make them Jews before they became Christians. Thus the principles held by the enlightened Stephen, the truths for which, in part, he had suffered martyrdom, were by them first brought into practice and realized. And if in this way, independently of the exertions of the apostles in Judea, and the development of Christianity in a Jewish form, churches had been raised of purely Hellenistic materials among the heathen, free altogether from Judaism, and if Paul had then appeared to confirm and extend this mode of operation, one consequence might have been, that the older apostles would have maintained with greater stiffness their former standing-point, in opposition to this freer direction of Christianity, and thus, by the overweight of human peculiarities in the first publishers of the gospel, a violent and irreconcilable opposition might have divided the Church into two hostile parties. It could not have happened otherwise if the germinating differences, left altogether to them-

* In Acts xi. 20, the common reading *ἡλληνοτάς* is evidently to be rejected, as formed from a false gloss, and the reading which refers to the Gentiles (*ἑλλήνας*) must be substituted as undoubtedly correct.

selves, as in later times, had been so developed as to exclude all hopes of a reconciliation, and the idea of an universal church, overcoming by its higher unity all human differences, could never have been realized. But this disturbing influence, with which the self-seeking and one-sided bias of human nature threatened from the beginning to destroy the unity of the divine work, was counteracted by the still mightier influence of the Holy Spirit, who never allows human differences to develop themselves to such an extreme, but is able to maintain unity in manifoldness. We may distinctly recognise the attractive divine power which gives scope to the free agency of man, but knows exactly when it is needful for the success of the divine work, to impart its immediate illumination, if we observe that at the precise moment when the apostles needed a wider development of their Christian knowledge for the exercise of their calling, and their former contracted views would have been highly injurious, what had been hitherto wanting was imparted to them, by a memorable coincidence of an internal revelation with a train of outward circumstances. The apostle Peter was the chosen instrument on this occasion.

Peter made a visitation from Jerusalem to the churches founded in Judea, Samaria, and towards the west near the Mediterranean. The cures effected by him in Christ's name in the large town of Lydda,* and in the city of Joppa (Jaffa), a few miles distant, drew upon him the universal attention of that very populous and extensive district on the coast of the Mediterranean, (the plain of Saron). Many were converted by him to Christianity, and the city of Joppa became the central point of his labours. As the publication of his new doctrine made such an impression in these parts, information respecting it would easily spread to Cæsarea Stratonis, a town on the sea-coast about eight miles distant. In the Roman cohort which formed the garrison of this place, was a centurion,

* According to Josephus (*Antiq.* xx. 6, § 2), a town as large as a city, in later times a considerable city under the name of Diospolis.

Cornelius* by name, a Gentile who, dissatisfied with the old popular religion, and seeking after one that would

* We must here take notice of what Gfrörer alleges against the historical truth of this narrative. He maintains, "that the principle, that the heathens were to be incorporated with the Christian church by baptism, without the observance of the Mosaic law, was first expressed by Paul, and that Peter was brought to acknowledge it by his influence. The conduct of Peter at Antioch, as it is described in the 2d chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, is inexplicable, if he attained his knowledge on this subject, in an independent manner, by a divine revelation. If, on the contrary, it was only impressed upon him from without, by the preponderating influence of Paul, it is then easy to account for his again wavering under the opposite influences of the adherents of James." But whoever understands the relation of the divine and the human to one another, in the development of the religious life, cannot be surprised, if in the soul of a man, who in general held a truth with divine confidence and clearness, the apprehension of it should, in an unfavourable moment, undergo a transient obscuration, by the influence of foreign elements, which would afterwards be removed by the return of divine light. But it is by no means evident, that Peter at that time held an erroneous conviction. It was only the violence of a sudden impression, which, through the peculiarity of his natural temperament, had too much power over Peter, and made him practically faithless to those principles which he had by no means abandoned from deliberate reflection. Paul even reproached him with thus acting in contradiction to his principles, that he who was living as a Gentile (*ἡμιθέος ὢν*), now practically laid an injunction on the Gentile Christians, that they must submit to the Mosaic law. Certainly, a great change must have passed on Peter, if he had been brought so to act, that Paul could say to him that he himself had been living as a Gentile. But if this was not connected with some previous preparation in the peculiar religious development of Peter, it would be difficult to attribute it solely to Paul's influence. Paul nowhere asserts that Peter was first led by him to adopt these views: on the contrary, he speaks of a revelation made by the Divine Spirit on this point to the apostles and prophets. Eph. iii. 5. If we look at the question in a purely psychological point of view, we may indeed presume, that Peter could not have arrived at a conviction of Christian truth on this point, without a severe mental struggle; and in this struggle of the divine and the human in his soul,

tranquillize his mind, was led by acquaintance with Judaism, to the foundation of a living faith in the one God. Having with his whole family professed the worship of Jehovah, he testified by his benefactions the sympathy he felt with his fellow-worshippers of the Jewish nation ; and observed the hours of prayer customary to the Jews ; so that there is scarcely any room to doubt that he belonged to the class of Proselytes of the Gate. Nor can we infer the contrary from the circumstance that Peter and the stricter Jewish Christians looked on Cornelius as an unclean person, and in many respects, the same as a heathen. The Proselytes of the Gate were certainly permitted to attend the synagogue worship, which was a means of gradually bringing them to a full reception of Judaism. Yet the Jews who adopted the stricter maxims of the Pharisees, placed all the uncircumcised in the class of the unclean, and avoided living and eating with such persons as defiling. Unless we suppose this to have been the case, what afterwards occurred in reference to the

that ecstatic vision would find its natural point of connection, and occur at a critical juncture, to accomplish the victory of Christian truth, over the reaction of his Jewish mode of thinking. Nor can I with Gfrörer perceive in Acts xi. 3, the traces of a more correct account bearing evidence against the narrative. That Peter made no scruple of incorporating Gentiles by baptism with the Christian church, might unquestionably be inferred, if he shunned not to eat and drink with them. Still, we might with equal confidence infer, that a Jewish teacher, who had no scruple to administer baptism to Gentiles, might not come to the conclusion to consider them of equal rank in the Christian theocracy, and admit them to every kind of intercourse. But though Peter afterwards reckoned the publication of the gospel among the heathen as the special calling of Paul, and the publication of it among native Jews as his own, it is by no means contradictory, that he, when a special demand was made upon him, should exercise his ministry among the Gentiles ; just as Paul, although the apostle of the Gentiles, gladly embraced the opportunity, when he could find an entrance among the Jews. But in Acts xi. 9, a different spirit speaks from that of the Petrine party, from whom, according to Gfrörer, this narrative, and in general the first part of the Acts, was derived.

stricter pharisaical-minded Jewish Christians, and the Gentile Christians who had been partly Proselytes of the Gate, would appear altogether enigmatical.

As to the remarkable manner in which this devout truth-seeking man (in whose heart God's Spirit had awakened so lively a sense of his spiritual necessities) was led to mental peace, in order to have a clear conception of the whole proceeding, we must bear in mind that the Acts of the Apostles is not intended to develop all the circumstances which belong to the representation of the exact historical connection of events; and that in reference to the manner in which Cornelius was prompted to seek out Peter, his own narrative is the only immediate source of information. But we are not justified to assume that Cornelius, who certainly could best testify of the facts relating to his own state of mind, of what he had himself experienced, was equally capable of clearly distinguishing the objective, the external matter of fact from the subjective of his own mental state, in what presented itself to him as an object of his own experience and perception. It was natural also for him not to think of tracing out the connection of the higher revelations made to him, with the preparative natural circumstances; but that the divine in the affair which wholly occupied his thoughts should remain alone in his remembrance, and be brought forward in his narrative, while the preparatives in the natural connection of causes and effects retired into the back ground. We are also permitted and justified to supply many circumstances, which though not expressly mentioned, are yet to be supposed; not in order to obscure what was divine in the event, but to glorify the manifold wisdom of God as shewn in the way men are led to a participation of redemption, in the connection of the divine and the natural, and in the harmony that subsists between nature and grace. Ephes. iii. 10.

Cornelius had devoted himself for some days to fasting and prayer, which were frequently used conjointly by the Jews and first Christians—the former as the means of making the soul more capable (by detaching it from sense)

for undisturbed converse with divine things. This they were wont to do when, in an emergency from inward or outward distress, they sought relief and illumination from God. We may, therefore, presume that something similar was the case with Cornelius; and naturally ask, What it was that so troubled him? From the whole narrative we see that his ardent longing was for religious truth that would bring peace and repose to his heart. Hence it is most probable, that on that account he sought illumination from God by fervent prayer. And what occasioned his seeking it precisely at this time? From the words of the Angel to Cornelius, it is by no means certain that the apostle Peter was wholly unknown to him. Peter himself, in his discourse before the family of Cornelius, Acts x. 37, appears to have presumed that he had already heard of the doctrine of Christ. It is also probable, that a matter which had already excited such great attention in this district, and which was so closely related to his religious wants, had not escaped his notice. He had probably heard very various opinions respecting Christianity; from many zealous Jews judgments altogether condemnatory; from others, sentiments which led him to expect that in the new doctrine he would at last find what he had been so long seeking: thus a conflict would naturally arise in his mind which would impel him to seek illumination from God on a question that so anxiously occupied his thoughts.

It was the fourth day* since Cornelius had been in this state of mind, when, about three in the afternoon,

* It will be proper here to give the right interpretation of Acts x. 30. Many have interpreted the words as equivalent to—"Four days ago I fasted to this time,"—namely, the ninth hour when he was speaking, and then only one fast-day was kept by Cornelius, in the ninth hour of which this happened. This agrees perfectly with the reckoning of the time. But the meaning of *ἡμεῖς* favours our rendering the passage, from the fourth day I fasted to the ninth hour, in which this happened. Kuinoel's objection to this interpretation is not pertinent; for, from the manner in which Cornelius expressed himself, it must be evident that the vision happened on the ninth hour of the fourth fast-day. Now, this

one of the customary Jewish hours of prayer, while he was calling on God with earnest supplication, he received by a voice from Heaven an answer to his prayers. The appearance of the angel may be considered as an objective event. The soul belongs in its essence to a higher than the sensible and temporal order of things, and none but a contracted and arrogant reason can deny the possibility of a communication between the higher world and the soul which is allied to it by its very nature. The Holy Scriptures teach us, that such communications from a higher spiritual world to individuals used to occur in the history of mankind, until the central point of all communications from heaven to earth, the Divine Fountain of life itself appeared among us, and thereby established for ever the communion between heaven and earth; John i. 52. We need not suppose any sensible appearance, for we know not whether a higher spirit cannot communicate itself to men living in a world of sense, by an operation on the inward sense, so that this communication should appear under the form of a sensuous perception. Meanwhile, Cornelius himself is the only witness for the objective reality of the angelic appearance, and he can only be taken as a credible witness of what he *believed* that he had perceived. By the influence of the Divine Spirit, an elevation of mind might be naturally connected with his devotion, in which the internal communication from heaven might be represented to the higher self-consciousness under the form of a vision.* Although, in the words of the angel, "Thy

passage can be understood to mean, either that Cornelius was wont to fast four days throughout to three o'clock, or that for four days he fasted entirely to the ninth hour of the fourth day when this happened. But fasts, according to the Jewish Christian mode of speaking, did not imply an entire abstinence from all nourishment. I cannot agree with Meier's interpretation, as I understand it, that Peter meant that he had fasted four days, and on the fourth day, reckoning backwards, that is, the day on which the fast began, about the third hour this event happened.

* The word *ἑώρα* (Acts x. 3) cannot here be decisive, since

prayers and alms are come up before God," &c., the expression is anthropopathic, and adapted to the then Jewish mode of expression, this relates only to the form of the expression. It is the divine in human form. It is marked throughout by the thought so worthy of God, that the striving of the devout anxiety of Cornelius, which was shewn to the extent of his ability by prayer and works of love towards the worshippers of Jehovah,—of this germ of goodness, the fostering fatherly love of God had not been unmindful,—that God had heard the prayer of his longing after heavenly truth, and had sent him, in the person of Peter, a teacher of this truth. From the whole form of this narrative, it may be inferred that Cornelius considered the pointing out of Peter's place of residence, not as something that came to his knowledge in a natural way, but by a supernatural communication. It is indeed possible that he had heard it mentioned by others casually in conversation, but, as he had not thought further about it, it had completely escaped his recollection, and now in this elevated state of mind what had been forgotten was brought back again to his consciousness, without his thinking of the natural connection. After all, this is only possible, and we are by no means justified in considering it necessary. The possibility therefore remains, that this information was communicated in a supernatural way.

No sooner had Cornelius obtained this important and joyful certainty, than he sent two of his slaves, and a soldier that waited on him, who also was a Proselyte of the Gate, to fetch the longed-for teacher of divine truth. But this divine leading would not have attained its end, Peter would not have complied with the request of Cornelius, if he had not been prepared exactly at the same time, by the inward enlightening of the Divine Spirit, to acknowledge and rightly interpret this outward call of God. In the conjunction of remarkable circumstances which it was necessary should meet so critically, in order

it may be used in speaking of an ecstatic vision, or of a vision as an objective fact.

to bring about this important result for the historical development of Christianity, the guiding wisdom of eternal Love undoubtedly manifests itself.

It was about noon, on the next day, when Peter withdrew to the roof of the house (built flat, in the oriental style) where he lodged at Joppa, in order to offer up his mid-day devotions. We can easily suppose, that the prayer of the man who had been so zealously occupied in publishing the gospel in that region, would especially relate to this great object, the extension of the kingdom of Christ. He might have heard frequent reports that here and there heathens had shewn themselves susceptible of the gospel, when proclaimed to them by the scattered Christian Hellenists; he might have called to mind many intimations in the discourses of Christ; new views respecting the spread of the gospel might have opened to his mind; but he ventured not to surrender himself to these impressions, he was as yet too much fettered by the power of Jewish prejudices, and hence, probably, a conflict was raised in his mind. While thus occupied in prayer, the demands of animal nature pressed upon him. He arose for the noon-tide meal, which must have been just ready. In the mean time, the meditations which had occupied him in prayer, abstracted him from sensible objects. Two tendencies of his nature came into collision. The higher, the power of the Divine, had the mastery over his spirit, and the power of sensuous wants over his lower nature. Thus, it came to pass, that the Divine and the Natural were mingled together,* not so as to obscure the Divine; but the Divine availed itself of the reflection of the Natural as an image, a symbolic vehicle for the truth about to be revealed to Peter. The divine light that was breaking through the atmosphere

* What Plutarch says of such an appearance of the higher life is remarkable: "*ὡς οἱ δίδωσι τῶν ἄμα κύπλων καταφθιμένων σωμάτων οὐκ ἐκτετατοῦσι βιβάσις, ἀλλὰ κύπλων μὲν ὑπ' ἀνάγκης φερόμενων, κάτω δὲ φύσει ῥιπνόντων, γίνονται τινες ἐξ ἀμφοῖν παρεχόμενης καὶ παραφόρου ἰλιγμῶς, οὕτως ὁ καλούμενος ἰνθουσιασμὸς τοιαυτοῖς μῆξιν εἶναι κινήσεων δοῖν, τὴν μὲν ὡς πίπτοντι τῆς ψυχῆς ἄμα τὴν δὲ ὡς πίπτουσι κινουμένης.*"—De Pyth. Orac. c. 21.

of traditionary representations, and making its way to his spirit, revealed itself in the mirror of sensible images which proceeded from the existing state of his bodily frame. Absorbed in divine meditations, and forgetting himself in the Divine, Peter saw heaven open, and from thence a vessel, "as it had been a great sheet knit at four corners," * corresponding to the four quarters of the heavens, was let down to the earth. In this vessel he saw birds, four-footed beasts, and edible creeping things of various kinds, and a voice from heaven called upon him to slay one or other of these creatures, and to prepare them for food. But against this requirement his Jewish notions revolted, accustomed as he was to distinguish between clean and unclean meats. He now heard a voice from heaven which refuted his scruples with these very significant words, "What God hath cleansed that call not thou common." It is clear, that in the explanation of these pregnant words, many circumstances conspired. First, in their application to the objects here sensibly represented. "Thou must not by human perversity make a distinction of clean and unclean between creatures, all of which God has declared to be clean, by letting them down to thee from heaven." This letting down from heaven is partly a symbol, that all are alike clean as being the creatures of God,—partly, that by the new revelation, the new creation from heaven presents all as pure. Then the higher application of these words

* If the words *διὰ τεσσάρων ᾠκίων* (Acts x. 11) are genuine, yet, on comparing them with xi. 5, we must, with Meyer, interpret them, not, "bound together at the four corners," but, "bound to four corners." But it is a question, whether these words, which are wanting in the Cod. Alex. *α. α.* and in the Vulgate, are not to be considered as a gloss, and left out, as in Lachman's edition, and then the clause will be equivalent to "letting itself down at four corners from heaven," as the Vulgate translates it, "*quatuor initiis submitti de celo.*" At all events, these four corners are not unimportant. As they corresponded to the four quarters of the heavens, they convey an intimation that men from the north and south, the east and the west, would appear as clean before God, and be called to a participation of the kingdom of God.

intended by the Spirit of God, is in reference to the relation of man to God, intimating that every distinction of clean and unclean would be taken away from among men ; that all men as the creatures of God would be considered as alike clean, and again become so as at their original creation, by the redemption that related to all.

After Peter had again expressed his scruples, this voice was repeated a third time, and he saw the vessel taken up again to heaven. He now returned from the state of ecstatic vision, to that of ordinary consciousness. While he was endeavouring to trace the connection between the vision and the subject of his late meditations, the event that now occurred taught him what the Spirit of God intended by that vision. Voices of strangers in the court of the house, by whom his own name was repeated, excited his attention. They were the three messengers of Cornelius who were inquiring for him. They had left Cæsarea the day before at three o'clock, and arrived at Joppa that very day about noon. While Peter was observing the men, who by their appearance were evidently not Jews, the Spirit of God imparted to him a knowledge of the connection between the symbolic vision and the errand of these persons. A voice within said, God has sent these men to seek thee out, that thou mayest preach the gospel to the heathen. Go confidently with them ; without dreading intercourse with the Gentiles as unclean, for thou hast been taught by a voice from heaven, that thou must not dare to consider those unclean whom God himself has pronounced clean, and whom he now sends to thee. On the next day, he departed with the messengers from Joppa, accompanied by six other Christians of Jewish descent, to whom he had told what had happened, and who awaited the result with eager expectation. As the distance for one day's journey was too great, they made two short days' journeys of it. On the day after their departure, (the fourth after the messengers had been dispatched by Cornelius,) about three in the afternoon they arrived at Cæsarea. They found Cornelius assembled with his family and friends, whom he had informed of the expected arrival of the teacher sent to him from hea-

ven ; for he doubted not that he whom the voice of the angel had notified as the appointed divine teacher, would obey the divine call. After what had passed, Peter appeared to Cornelius as a super-earthly being. He fell reverentially before him as he entered the chamber ; but Peter bade him stand up, and said, " Stand up, I myself also am a man." He narrated to the persons assembled, by what means he had been induced not to regard the common scruples of the Jews respecting intercourse with heathens, and expressed his desire to hear from Cornelius what had determined them to call him thither. Cornelius explained this, and ended with saying, " Now therefore, are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." Peter was astonished at the pure disposition so susceptible of divine truth, which appeared in the words of Cornelius, and formed so striking a contrast to the obstinate unsusceptibility of many Jews ; and perceived the hand of God in the way Cornelius had been led, since he had sought the truths of salvation with upright desire ; he therefore said, " Now, I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons ; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." As to these memorable words of Peter, the sense cannot be, that in every nation, every one who only rightly employs his own moral power, will obtain salvation ; for had Peter meant this, he would, in what he added, announcing Jesus as him by whom alone men could obtain forgiveness of sin and salvation—have contradicted himself. On that supposition, he ought rather to have told Cornelius, that he had only to remain in his present disposition, that was enough, and he needed no new doctrine of salvation. But, on the other hand, it is impossible, according to the connection, to understand by " every one that feareth God and worketh righteousness," those who had attained true piety through Christianity, and to make the words mean no more than this—that Christians of all nations are acceptable to God : for the words plainly import that Cornelius, on account of his upright pious striving, was deemed worthy

of having his prayers heard, and being led to faith in the Redeemer. Nor can these words relate only to such who already believed in the revelation of God in the Old Testament, and, according to its guidance, honoured God, and expected the Messiah. But evidently Peter spoke in opposition to the Jewish Nationalism—God judgeth men not according to their descent or non-descent from the theocratic nation, but according to their disposition. All who, like Cornelius, honour God uprightly according to the measure of the gift entrusted to them, are acceptable to him, and he prepares by his grace a way for them, by which they are led to faith in Him, who alone can bestow salvation. This is what Peter meant to announce to them.*

It was natural that, since the minds of these persons were so much more prepared than others for the appropriation of saving truth, and for living faith by their inward want and earnest longing, that the word would make a much quicker and more powerful impression on them. While Peter was speaking to them, they were impelled to express their feelings in inspired praises of that God, who in so wonderful a manner, had led them to salvation. One inspiration seized all, and with amaze-

* Cornelius belonged to that class of persons who are pointed out in John iii. 21. We are by no means authorized to maintain that Peter, from the general position laid down by him, intended to draw the inference, that God would certainly lead to salvation those among all nations, to whom the marks belonged which he here specified, even, if they did not during their earthly life obtain a participation in redemption. He expressed that truth, which at the moment manifested itself to him in a consciousness enlightened by the Holy Spirit, without reflecting on all the consequences deducible from it. We must ever carefully distinguish between what enlightened men consciously intend to say, according to historical conditions, and in relation to interests immediately affected by existing circumstances,—and what forms the contents of eternal truth, to be developed with all the consequences involved. To develop the first is the province of exegesis and historical apprehension, the second that of Christian faith and morals.

ment the Jewish Christians present beheld their prejudices against the Gentiles contradicted by the fact. What an impression must it have made upon them, when they heard the Gentile who had been considered by them as unclean, testify with such inspiration of Jehovah and the Messiah! And now Peter could appeal to this transaction, in order to nullify all the scruples of the Jews, respecting the baptism of such uncircumcised persons, and ask, "Who can forbid water that these should be baptized, who have already received the baptism of the Spirit like ourselves?" And when he returned to Jerusalem, and the manner in which he had held intercourse with the Gentiles had raised a stumbling-block among the strict pharisaical believers, he was able to silence them by a similar appeal. "Forasmuch then (said he), as God gave them the like gift, as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could withstand God?" Acts xi. 17.

BOOK III.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND FOUNDING OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH AMONG THE GENTILES BY THE
INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

CHAPTER I.

PAUL'S PREPARATION AND CALL TO BE THE APOSTLE OF
THE GENTILES.

IN this manner, Christianity, independently of Judaism, began to be propagated among the Gentiles; the appointment of the gospel as a distinct means of forming all nations for the kingdom of God, was now acknowledged by the apostles; and consequently, on *their* part, no opposition could be made to employing it for this purpose. While, by the arrangements of the divine wisdom, the principal obstacle to the conversion of the heathen was taken out of the way, and the first impulse was given to that work; by the same wisdom, that great champion of the faith who was to carry it on, and lay the foundation for the salvation of the heathen through all ages, was called forth, to take the position assigned him in the development of the kingdom of God. This was no other than the apostle Paul; a man distinguished, not only for the wide extent of his apostolic labours, but for his development of the fundamental truths of the gospel in their living organic connection, and their formation into a compact system. The essence of the gospel in relation to human nature, on one side especially, the relation namely to its need of redemption, was set by him in the clearest light; so that when the sense of that need has been long repressed or perverted, and a revival of Chris-

tian consciousness has followed a state of spiritual death, the newly awakened Christian life, whether in the church at large, or in individuals, has always drawn its nourishment from his writings. As he has presented Christianity under this aspect especially, and has so impressively shewn the immediate relation of religious knowledge and experience to the Lord Jesus, in opposition to all dependence on any human mediation whatever, thus drawing the line of demarcation most clearly between the Christian and Jewish standing-point;—he may be considered as the representative among the apostles of the Protestant principle. And history, though it furnishes only a few hints respecting the early life of Paul before his call to the apostleship, has recorded enough to make it evident, that by the whole course of his previous development, he was formed for what he was to become, and for what he was to effect.

Saul or Paul (the former the original Hebrew, the latter the Hellenistic form of his name),* was a native

* The latter was his usual appellation, from the time of his being devoted entirely to the conversion of the heathen; Acts xiii. 9. Although the ancient supposition, that he changed his own name for that of his convert Sergius Paulus, has been recently advocated by Meyer and Olshausen, I cannot approve of it. I cannot imagine that the conversion of a proconsul would be thought so much more of by him than the conversion of any other man (and he was far from being his first convert), as to induce him to assume his name. It is more agreeable to the usage of ancient times, for the scholar to be named after his teacher (as Cyprian after Cæcilius, Eusebius after Pamphilus), rather than for the teacher to be named after the scholar; for no one could think of finding a parallel in the instance of Scipio Africanus. And had this really been the reason why Paul assumed the name, we might have expected, as it was closely connected with the whole narrative, that Luke would have expressly assigned it. And Fritzsche is correct in saying (see his Commentary on the Romans, Proleg. p. 11), that, in this case, not Acts xiii. 9, but xiii. 13, would have been a natural place for mentioning it. Still I cannot, with Fritzsche, think it probable, that Luke was accidentally led, by the mention of Sergius Paulus, to remark that Paul also bore the same name. The most na-

of the city of Tarsus in Cilicia. This we learn from his own expressions in Acts xxi. 39, xxii. 3, and the contradictory tradition reported by Jerome, that he was born in the small town of Gischala, in Galilee, cannot appear credible, though it is not improbable that his parents once resided there,* which may have given rise to the report. As we do not know how long he remained un-

tural way of viewing the matter seems to be this: Luke had hitherto designated him by the name which he found in the memoirs lying before him on the early history of Christianity. But he was now induced to distinguish him by the name which he found in the memoirs of his labours among the heathen, and by which he had personally known him during that later period; and, therefore, took the opportunity of remarking, that this Paul was no other than the individual whom he had hitherto called Saul.

* If we were justified in understanding with Paulus (in his work on the Apostle Paul's Epistles to the Galatians and Romans, p. 323), the word *Ἰσραήλιος*, Phil. iii. 5, 2 Cor. xi. 22, as used in contradistinction to *Ἰλλυριεύς*, it would serve to confirm this tradition, since it would imply that Paul could boast of a descent from a Palestinian-Jewish and not Hellenistic family. But since Paul calls himself *Ἰσραήλιος*, though he was certainly by birth a Hellenist, it is evident that the word cannot be used in so restricted a sense; and in the second passage quoted above, where it is equivalent to an Israelite, a descendant of Abraham, it plainly has a wider meaning; see Bleek's admirable Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 32. This tradition too, reported by Jerome, is, as Fritzsche justly remarks, very suspicious, not only on account of the gross anachronism, which makes the taking of Gischala by the Romans the cause of Paul's removal thence with his parents,—since this event happened much later in the Jewish war, but also because Jerome, in his Commentary on the Epistle to Philemon (verse 23), makes use of this tradition to explain why Paul, though a citizen of Tarsus, calls himself, 2 Cor. xi. 22, Philip. iii. 5, "*Hebræus ex Hebræis*, et cætera quæ illum Judæum magis indicant quam Tarsensem," which yet, as we have remarked above, proceeds only from a misunderstanding of the epithet which Paul applies to himself. Jerome must have, therefore, taken up this false account (talem fabulam accepimus, are his own words), without proof, in a very thoughtless manner.

der the paternal roof, it is impossible to determine what influence his education in the metropolis of Cilicia, (which as a seat of literature vied with Athens and Alexandria),* had on the formation of his character. Certainly, his early acquaintance with the language and national peculiarities of the Greeks, was of some advantage in preparing him to be a teacher of Christianity among nations of Grecian origin. Yet the few passages from the Greek poets which we meet with in his discourse at Athens, and in his Epistles, do not prove that his education had made him familiar with Grecian literature: nor is it probable that such would be the case. As his parents designed him to be a teacher of the law, or Jewish theologian, his studies must have been confined in his early years to the Old Testament, and about the age of 12 or 13, he must have entered the school of Gamaliel.† It is possible, though, considering Paul's pharisaic zeal, not probable, that the more liberal views of his tolerant-minded teacher Gamaliel might induce him to turn his attention to Grecian literature. A man of his mental energy, whose zeal overcame all difficulties in his career, and whose love prompted him to make himself familiar with all the mental habitudes of the men among whom he laboured, that he might sympathize more completely with their wants and infirmities, might be induced, while among people of Grecian culture, to acquire some knowledge of their principal writers. But in the style of his representations, the Jewish element evidently predominates. His peculiar mode of argumentation was not formed in the Grecian, but in the Jewish

* Strabo, who wrote in the time of Augustus, places Tarsus in this respect above these two cities: "ταύτη γὰρ ἰσθᾶδε ἀνδρώπαις σπουδὴ πρὸς τὴν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ τὴν ἑλληνὶ γυμνασίῳ ἀπάσῃ παιδείᾳ γίγνεται, ὥστε ὅτι ἐκείνους καὶ Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείαν καὶ ἵ, τὴν ἑλλὰς τόσον δυνατὸν ἵσταν, ὡς σχολαὶ καὶ διατριβαὶ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν γίγνεται." Geogr. i. 14, c. 5.

† See Tholuck's admirable remarks in the "Studien und Kritiken," 1835, 2d part, p. 366.

school. The name Saul, *שׂאול*,* the desired one, the one prayed for, perhaps indicates, that he was the first-born of his parents,† granted in answer to their earnest prayers: and hence it may be inferred, that he was devoted by his father, a Pharisee, to the service of religion, and sent in early youth to Jerusalem, that he might be trained to become a learned expounder of the law and of tradition; not to add, that it was usual for the youth of Tarsus,‡ to complete their education at some foreign school. Most advantageously for him, he acquired in the pharisaic schools at Jerusalem, that systematic form of intellect, which afterwards rendered him such good service in developing the contents of the Christian doctrine; so that, like Luther, he became thoroughly conversant with the theological system, which afterwards, by the power of the gospel, he uprooted and destroyed. A youth so ardent and energetic as Paul, would throw his whole soul into whatever he undertook; his natural temperament would dispose him to an overflowing impetuous zeal, and for such a propensity Pharisaism supplied abundant aliment. We may also infer from his peculiar disposition, as well as from various hints he gives of himself, that in legal piety, according to the notions of the strictest Pharisaism, he strove to go beyond all his companions. But in proportion to the earnestness of his striving after holiness—the more he combated the refractory impulses of an ardent and powerful nature, which refused to be held in by the reins of the law—so much more ample were his opportunities for understanding from his own experience the woeful discord in human nature which arises when the moral consciousness asserts its claims as a controlling law, while the man feels himself constantly carried away in defiance of his better longing and willing, by the force of ungodly inclination. Paul could not have depicted this con-

* We cannot attach much importance to so uncertain an inference.

† Like the names Theodorus, Theodoret, common among Christians in the first century.

‡ See Strabo.

dition so strikingly and to the life, in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, if he had not gained the knowledge of it from personal experience. It was advantageous for him that he passed over to Christianity, from a position where, by various artificial restraints and prohibitions, he had attempted to guard against the incursions of unlawful desires and passions, and to compel himself to goodness; * for thus he was enabled to testify from his own experience—(in which he appears as the representative of all men of deep moral feeling)—how deeply the sense of the need of redemption is grounded in the moral constitution of man; and thus likewise from personal experience, he could describe the relation of that inward freedom which results from faith in redemption, to the servitude of the legal standing-point. In his conflict with himself while a Pharisee, Paul's experiences resemble Luther's in the cloisters of Erfurt: though in the Pharisaic dialectics and exposition of the law, he was a zealous and faithful disciple of Gamaliel, we cannot from this conclude that he imbibed that spirit of moderation for which his master was so distinguished, and which he showed in his judgment of the new sect at the first, before it came into direct conflict with the theology of his party. For the scholar, especially a scholar of so energetic and marked a character, would imbibe the mental influences of his teacher, only so far as they accorded with his own peculiarities. His unyielding disposition, the fire of his nature, and the fire of his youth, made him a vehement persecuting zealot against all who opposed the system that was sacred in his eyes. Accordingly, no sooner did the new doctrine in the hands of Stephen assume a hostile aspect † against the Pharisaic theology,

* As, for example, from the standing-point of Pharisaism, it has been said, "Instead of leaving every thing to the free movements of the disposition, a man should force himself to do this or that good by a direct vow. Vows are the enclosures of holiness." נִדְרִים סִיג לְפָרִישָׁתָא. See Pirke Avoth. § 13.

† The question has been raised, whether Paul saw and heard Jesus during his earthly life? We have not the data

than he became its most vehement persecutor. After the martyrdom of Stephen, when many adherents of

for answering the question. In his Epistles, we find nothing conclusive either one way or the other. Olshausen thinks that it may be inferred from 2 Cor. v. 16, that Paul really knew Jesus during his earthly life, *κατὰ σάρκα*. Paul, in that passage, he understands as saying, "But if I knew Christ, as indeed I did know him, according to the flesh, in his bodily earthly appearance, yet now I know him so no more." Against this interpretation I will not object with Baur, in his Essay "On the Party of Christ in the Corinthian Church," in the Tübingen "Zeitschrift für Theologie," 1831, part iv., p. 95, that he could not mean this, because it would have been undervaluing Christ in his state of humiliation, which would be in contradiction to those passages in which he attributes to that state the highest abiding importance, and says he is determined to know nothing save Christ and him crucified. For though the remembrance of Christ in the form of a servant could never vanish from his mind, though he never could forget what he owed to Christ the Crucified, yet now he knew him no longer as living in human weakness, and subject to death, but as having risen victoriously from death, the glorified one, now living in divine power and majesty; 2 Cor. xiii. 4. The relation in which it would have been possible to stand to Christ while he lived in the form of a servant on earth, could no longer exist. No one could now stand nearer to him, simply for being a Jew; no one could hold converse with him in an outward manner, as a being present to the senses: henceforth it was only possible to enter into union with Christ as the glorified one, as he presented himself to the religious consciousness in a spiritual, internal manner, by believing on him as crucified for the salvation of mankind. In this respect, Paul might well say that *now* there could no longer be for him such "a knowledge of Christ after the flesh." And we grant that he might have said *hypothetically*, If I had known Christ heretofore after the flesh, had I stood in any such outward communion with him as manifest in the flesh, yet *now* such a communion would have lost all its importance for me (such a value as those Judaizers attribute to it who make it the sign of genuine apostleship); but now I know Christ after the spirit, like all those who enjoy spiritual communion with him. But Paul could only say this in a purely hypothetical form, supposing something to be which really was not; for allowing that he had seen and heard Jesus with his bodily senses, his opponents

the gospel sought for safety by flight, Paul felt himself called to counterwork them in the famed city of Damascus, where the new sect was gaining ground. And he hastened thither, after receiving full powers for committing all the Christians to prison from the Sanhedrim, who, as the highest ecclesiastical authority among the Jews, were allowed by the Romans to inflict all disciplinary punishment against the violators of the law.*

As for the great mental change which Paul experienced in the course of this journey, undertaking for the extinction of the Christian faith, it is quite possible that this event may strike us as sudden and marvellous, only because the history records the more fact, without the various preparatory and connecting circumstances which led to it; but, by making use of the hints which the narrative furnishes to fill up the outline, we

would have been far from attaching any importance to such seeing and hearing, as it could have been affirmed with equal truth of many Jews, who stood in an indifferent or even hostile position towards Christ. The reference in this passage can be only to such a "knowing of Christ after the flesh," as belonged to the other apostles, since only to this could any religious value be attached against which Paul might feel himself called to protest. For this reason I must agree with Baur, who understands "*χρυσός*," here, not of the person of Jesus, but of the Messiah, a Messiah known after the flesh, as from the early Jewish standing-point. I also believe with Baur, that if Paul had intended a personal reference, he would have said '*Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*,' and I cannot admit the force of the objection which Olshausen makes to this interpretation, that it would require the article before *χρυσός*, for it means not *the* Messiah definitively, but generally *a* Messiah.

* If Damascus at that time still belonged to a Roman province, the Sanhedrim could exercise its authority there, in virtue of the right secured every where to the Jews to practise their worship in their own manner. If the city was brought under the government of the Arabian King Aretas, the Sanhedrim could still reckon on his support, in consequence of the connection he had formed with the Jews; perhaps he himself had gone over to Judaism. The Jews in Damascus might also possess great influence by means of the women, who were almost all converts to Judaism. Josephus, *De Bell. Jud.* ii. 20, 2.

may attempt to gain the explanation of the whole, on purely natural principles.

Paul—(it would be said by a person adopting this view of the event)—had received many impressions which disturbed the repose of his truth-loving soul; he had heard the temperate counsels of his revered instructor Gamaliel; he had listened to the address of Stephen, to whom he was allied in natural temperament, and had witnessed his martyrdom. But he was still too deeply imbued with the spirit of Pharisaism, to surrender himself to these impressions, so contrary to the prevailing bent of his mind. He forcibly repressed them; he rejected the thoughts that involuntarily rose in his mind in favour of the new doctrine, as the suggestions of Satan, whom he regarded as the sole contriver of this rebellion against the authority of the ancient traditions, and accordingly set himself with so much the greater ardour against the new sect. Yet he could not succeed altogether in suppressing these rising thoughts, and in silencing the voice of conscience, which rebuked his fanaticism. A conflict arose in his soul. While in this state, an outward impression was added, which brought the internal process to maturity. Not far from Damascus he and his followers were overtaken by a violent storm; the lightning struck Paul, and he fell senseless to the ground. He attributed this catastrophe to the avenging power of the Messiah, whom in the person of his disciples he was persecuting, and, confounding the objective and subjective, converted this internal impression into an outward appearance of Christ to him: blinded by the lightning, and stunned by the fall, he came to Damascus.—But admitting this explanation as correct, how are we to explain by natural causes the meeting of Paul with Ananias? Even here we may supply many particulars which are not expressly mentioned in the narrative. Since Ananias was noted even among the Jews as a man of strict legal piety, it is not improbable that he and Paul were previously acquainted with one another at Jerusalem. At all events, Paul had heard of the extraordinary spiritual gifts said to be possessed by Ananias, and

the thought naturally arose in his mind, that a man held in so much repute among the Christians, might be able to heal him and recover him from his present unfortunate condition; and while, occupied with this thought, his imagination formed it into a vision. On the other hand, we may suppose, that Ananias had heard something of the great change that had taken place in Paul; and yet might not give full credence to the report, till a vision corresponding to Paul's, and explicable on similar psychological principles, had overcome his mistrust.

In reference to this explanation, we must certainly allow the possibility that a change like that which took place in Paul, might have been prepared by impressions of the kind mentioned; but the narrative will not countenance either the necessity or probability of such a supposition. History furnishes us with numerous examples of the power of religious fanaticism over minds that in other respects have been susceptible of the true and the good, and yet, while under its influence, have used those very things to confirm them in their delusion which might seem fitted to rescue them from it. It is, therefore, quite consistent with the powerful character of Paul to believe that, in the martyrdom of Stephen, he saw only the power of the evil spirit over the mind of one who had been seduced from the pure faith of his fathers; and that hence he felt a stronger impulse to counterwork the propagation of a doctrine which could involve in such ruin men distinguished by their disposition and their talents. Besides, if only the impression which a storm with its attendant circumstances made upon him, was the fact that formed the groundwork of that vision of Christ—it would ill agree with this, that Paul's followers believed that they perceived something similar to what befel him; for this is only admissible, if we suppose them to have been like-minded with Paul, which could not be unless they were already Christians, or on the way to Christianity. But such persons would hardly attach themselves to a persecutor of Christians.*

* The variations in the narrative of these events contained

Such attempts at explaining the narrative are suspicious, because unusual natural appearances are made use of, to bring down what is extraordinary into the circle of common events. Instead, therefore, of following this explanation, which is attended with great difficulties—we might rather conceive the whole, independently of all outward phenomena, as an inward transaction in Paul's mind, a spiritual revelation of Christ to his higher self-consciousness; and, in this light, we may view the experiences which he had in his conflicts with himself while a Pharisee—and the impression of the discourse and martyrdom of Stephen—as forming a preparation by which his heart was rendered capable of receiving these internal revelations of the Redeemer. The divine origin and the reality of the fact will not be in the slightest degree affected by this explanation; for though we may conceive of outward supernatural appearances—still there would be nothing more than the means by which Paul would be prepared for that internal revelation of Christ, which formed the basis of his apostleship. The perceptions of the senses cannot have greater certainty and reality than the facts of a higher self-consciousness,

in Acts ix, xxii, and xxvi, prove nothing against the reality of the fact. Such unimportant differences might easily arise in the repetition of the narrative of an event so far removed from the circle of ordinary occurrences; and these differences need not be attributed to alterations in the narrative by Paul himself, but may be supposed to originate in the incorrectness of others in repeating it. As for the rest, if we assume that his attendants received only a general impression of the phenomenon, not so definite as Paul's, for whom it was mainly intended; that they saw a light, but no precise shape or figure; that they heard a voice, without distinguishing or understanding the words;—it is easy to perceive, that various representations would naturally be given of the event. As this phenomenon, from its very nature, cannot be judged of according to the laws of ordinary earthly communications and perceptions, the difference in the perceptions of Paul and his attendants, argues nothing against its objective reality. We are too ignorant of the laws which regulate the communications between a higher spiritual world and men living in a world of the senses, to determine any thing precisely on these points.

whereby a man receives revelations of an order of things in which his true life has its root, far above the sensible world, which he experiences and apprehends spiritually. And that this was no self-illusion, capable of being psychologically explained,* that extraordinary change would testify which was the result in Paul of this internal transaction—this the whole course of his apostolic ministry testifies, which may be traced to his inward experience, as the effect to its cause. But yet the manner in which his attendants were affected by what happened on this occasion, contradicts the supposition of a merely internal transaction, even if we could resolve on ascrib-

* Dr Strauss says, in his "Leben Jesu," vol. ii. p. 656, "Neander merely ventures to maintain an internal operation of Christ on the mind of Paul, and only adds the supposition of an outward appearance, as if it were a favour for his readers to grant it; and even the internal operation he makes superfluous, by particularising various influences which, in a natural way, might bring about such a revolution in such an individual's mind." But as to what concerns the latter, the conclusion from a possibility under certain presupposed circumstances, to that which actually took place in the absence of any historical proof of its taking place—is by no means justifiable, unless a person argues on an assumption which I do not admit, namely, that every thing must proceed according to the laws of natural psychological development, and that a supernatural operation cannot take place. But according to a mode of viewing this subject, which is as different from the caricature of supernaturalism, drawn by Dr Strauss and others, (let my readers compare the words of truth in Twisten's preface to the Second Volume of his "Dogmatik,") as from the views of Dr Strauss himself on the relation of God to the world—a supernatural operation by no means excludes a preparation in the natural development of man, nor does the latter make the former superfluous. With respect to the other point, the outward appearance of Christ, I do not indeed hold this as absolutely requisite for explaining the great revolution in the spiritual life of Paul, but the circumstances mentioned in the text, compared with the expressions of Paul himself, compel me to admit its reality, and I recognise the importance of it for Paul, in order that, like the other apostles, he might be able to testify of Christ as risen from the dead.

ing the state in which Paul came to Damascus, to the power of an internal impression.*

It will be of great service to compare with the narrative in the Acts the expressions used by Paul in his Epistles in reference to this event, so important to him as the commencement of a new era in his life. As he often refers to it in opposition to his Jewish adversaries, who were unwilling to acknowledge him as an apostle; so he had a confident persuasion that the apostolic commission was given him by Christ in the same manner as to the other apostles; this is expressed most fully and strongly in Gal. i. 1. Yet here we need not suppose an outward event to be meant, but may rather understand it of an internal transaction such as we have described. In the sixteenth verse, Paul evidently speaks of an internal communication of Christ, of an inward revelation of him to his self-consciousness,† whereby, independently of all human instruction, he was qualified to preach Christ. But something in addition to this is intended where Paul, in 1 Cor. ix. 1, appeals to his having seen

* The notion, that the vision which immediately preceded Paul's conversion, is the one described by himself in 2 Cor. xii. 2, which in modern times has been revived by several distinguished theologians, has every thing against it: In the latter, Paul describes his elevation in spirit to a higher region of the spiritual world; in the vision which occasioned his conversion, there was a revelation of Christ coming down to him while consciously living on the earth. The immediate impression of the first was depressing and humiliating; the second was connected with an extraordinary mental elevation, a tendency to pride and vain-glory. With the first his Christian consciousness began; the second marked one of the most exalted moments of his inward life, after he had long lived in communion with Christ; and by such a foretaste of heavenly existence, he was refreshed under his manifold conflicts, and animated to renew his earthly labours. The date of fourteen years mentioned here, is of no chronological use, farther than to satisfy us, that the date of Paul's conversion must be false, according to which he must have written this exactly fourteen years later.

† It is most natural to understand the phrase *ἐκ τῆς ἐνδοῦ* as denoting something internal.

Christ as a mark of his apostleship. * But this might refer to an ecstatic vision, similar to what Paul himself

* It must be evident to every unprejudiced person, that this cannot refer to Paul's having seen Jesus during his earthly life, (though a possible occurrence,) for it would have added nothing to his apostolic authority; nor yet to the mere knowledge of the doctrine of Christ. Rückert in his Commentary on this passage, maintains that it refers to one of the appearances of Christ, which were granted to him in a state of ecstatic vision, Acts xviii. 9, xxii. 17, than to that which occasioned his conversion, especially since an appearance of Christ of this kind is not mentioned either in Acts ix, xxii, xxvi, nor in Galat. i. 12-26. On the other hand, the following considerations deserve attention. Since, as Rückert himself acknowledges, the reading in that passage is to be preferred, in which the words, "Am I not an apostle?" are immediately followed by "Have I not seen Christ?" we may infer that Paul adduced his having seen Christ as a confirmation of his apostleship; as afterwards, for the same purpose, he adduces the success of his efforts in founding the Corinthian church. Without doubt, he urged this against his Judaizing opponents, who disputed his call to the apostleship on the ground, that he had not been appointed by Christ himself like the other apostles. In this connection, it is most natural to expect, that Paul would speak of that appearance of Christ, which marked the commencement of his apostolic career, that real appearance of Christ which he classes with the other appearances of the risen Saviour, 1 Cor. xv. 8, and not a mere vision. Rückert indeed maintains, that Paul made no distinction between the two kinds of appearances, for "otherwise he would have attributed no value to visions, as mere figments of the imagination." But this conclusion is not correct; for we may suppose something between a real objective appearance, and a natural creation of the imagination formed in the usual psychological manner, such an operation of the Divine Spirit on the higher self-consciousness, in virtue of which what is inwardly apprehended, presents itself to the person so influenced under a sensible image, whereby the imagination is turned into an organ, for what is inwardly apprehended by the operation of the Divine Spirit. That such a communication of the Divine Spirit may be distinguished both from a real appearance to the senses, and from a mere result of the imagination, is evident from many passages of Holy Writ, as for example, Peter's vision, Acts x. 12. The passage Gal. i. 16, does not exclude an appearance of Christ,

describes in 2 Cor. xii. 2. On the contrary, something different from this must be intended in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians where he places the appearance of Christ to himself on an equality with all the other appearances of the risen Saviour. And this declaration of Paul has additional weight, because, as is apparent from the passages before quoted in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he could so accurately distinguish an ecstatic state from a state of ordinary self-consciousness. Hence we also see how important it was for him, as well as the other apostles, to be enabled to testify, on the evidence of their own senses, of that great fact, the foundation of Christian faith and Christian hope—the real resurrection of Christ and his glorified personal existence.

Lastly, we by no means suppose a magical influence on Paul, by which he was carried away, and converted against his will. According to the view we have taken of this event, we suppose an internal point of connection, without which, no outward revelation or appearance could have become an inward one; without which, any outward impression that could have been made, however powerful, would have been transient in its results. But in his case, the love for the true and the good discernible even through his errors, though repressed by the power of his passions and prejudices, was to be set free from its thralldom, only by a mighty impression. Yet no external miracle whatever could have converted a Caiaphas into a preacher of the gospel.

It might be expected, that Paul could not at once, after such an impression, enter on a new course of action. Every thing which hitherto had been the motive and aim of his conduct, now seemed as nothing. Sorrow must have been the predominant feeling of his crushed spirit. He could not instantaneously recover from so overwhelming an impression, which gave a new direction to his whole being. He was reduced to a state

but it was foreign to the apostle's object to specify it. But the word *μνησιν* not *μνην*, Acts ix. 7, certainly implies, that Paul, in distinction from his attendants, had seen a *person*.

of mental and bodily weakness, from which he could not restore himself. He passed three days without food. This was for him the point of transition from death to a new life; and nothing can so vividly express his feelings at this awful crisis, as the exclamation which he himself, reverting to his earlier state, puts in the lips of the man who, with the deepest consciousness of inward slavery under the violated law, and with earnest aspirations after freedom, pours forth his whole heart in the words, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?"—Nor is it at all probable that, in this state, he would seek for social intercourse. Nothing could less agree with his feelings than intercourse with the Jews; nor could he easily prevail on himself to seek out the Christians, whom he had hitherto persecuted. To a man in this state of mind, nothing could be so welcome as solitude. Hence it is by no means probable, that information of the great change that had passed upon him, would be conveyed by other persons to Ananias. It is worthy of notice, that, in order to attain a full consciousness of his new life, and to make the transition from this intermediate state of contrition, to a new life of active exertion in communion with Christ, he was brought into connection with the existing Christian church, by the instrumentality of one of its members. In communion with other believers, he first obtained what he could not find in his solitude. When he prayed to Christ who had appeared to him, that he would help him in his distress, that he would enlighten both his bodily and mental eyes; it was promised to him in a vision, that a well-known enlightened man, belonging to the church at Damascus, whom he probably knew by name and sight, should be the instrument of his spiritual and bodily restoration. When Ananias, in obedience to a divine call, visited him, Paul recognised the person to whom the vision had referred him, and hence felt the fullest assurance, that in communion with him he should be made partaker of a new and higher principle of life. Ananias introduced Paul to the other Christians in the city; after he had been strengthened by spending several days in their so-

ciety, he felt himself impelled to enter the synagogues, and testify in behalf of that cause, which heretofore he had fiercely persecuted.* Whether he considered it best, after hearing this first testimony among the Jews, to allow its impression to work silently on their minds, without personally attempting to enforce it; or whether the plots of the Jews induced him to quit the place, we are not certain;† be this as it may, he visited the neigh-

* It is difficult to consider *ἡμετέροις ἡμέραις* in Acts ix. 19, and *ἡμετέροις ἡμέραις* in the 23d verse, as equivalent terms. Yet it cannot be proved from these words, that Luke by the latter meant to make a break in Paul's residence at Damascus, occasioned by a journey into Arabia, but the succession of events as narrated in the Acts leads to consider this as most natural. The *ἡμετέροις ἡμέραις* merely express the few days which Paul just after his baptism spent in the fellowship of the Christians at Damascus. The following phrase, *καὶ ἡμέρας*, intimates, that immediately after he had spent some days with the disciples he entered into the synagogues; and the *ἡμετέροις ἡμέραις* denote the whole period of Paul's stay at Damascus. Within this whole period of *ἡμετέροις ἡμέραις*, of which nothing more is told in the Acts, we must place Paul's journey into Arabia, of which we should not have known but for the mention of it in the Epistle to the Galatians.

† Schrader, in his Chronological Remarks on the Life of Paul, has lately maintained, that the words of Paul in Gal. i. 16, must be thus explained by means of the antithesis; he had not been instructed by men for his apostolic calling, but had retired to the neighbouring district of Arabia, in order to prepare himself in an independent manner, and in solitude. But had he meant to say this, he would scarcely have chosen the general designation *Ἀραβίας*, but rather have substituted for it *ἐρημὸς Ἀραβίας*, or simply *ἐρημὸς*, by which he would have marked more distinctly the object of this *ἀνιερχομαι*. It is psychologically most probable that Paul, after Ananias had visited him in his solitude, and revived his spirit, would not go again into retirement, but rather would seek the communion of other believers, and, after he had been edified and strengthened by them, would feel himself impelled forthwith to bear his testimony before those who held his former faith. This view is also strongly confirmed by the passage in the Epistle to the Galatians, for the connected sense seems to be as follows: As soon as God revealed his Son to me, that I might publish him among the Gentiles, I published the gospel in an independent manner, according to this revelation. Paul expresses this

bouring parts of Arabia, where he found opportunities for publishing the gospel among the Jews, who were spread over the country. He then returned again to Damascus. Whether the Jews, whose anger he had already excited by his former preaching, as soon as they heard of his coming, endeavoured to lay hold of a person who was so capable of injuring Judaism; or whether they were exasperated by his renewed addresses in their synagogues, he was obliged to consult his safety by flight, as his life was threatened by their machinations.—So far was this man, who shunned no danger in his subsequent career, though now in the first glow of conversion, a season when the mind is generally most prone to extravagance—so far was he from indulging in that enthusiastic ardour which seeks and craves for martyrdom!* He was let down by his friends in a basket, through the window of a house, built against the wall of the city, that he might escape unnoticed by the Jews, who were lying in wait for him at the gates. After three years had thus expired from the time of his conversion,† he resolved, about the year 39,‡ once more to return to Jeru-

sentiment both in a positive and negative form. I was not entrusted for my calling, by any human authority whatever, by none of the apostles at Jerusalem, but immediately travelled into Arabia, there to proclaim the gospel. Compare Auger's profound and acute inquiry "de temporum in Actis Apostolorum ratione." Lipsiæ 1833, p. 23.

* "The glorying in infirmities," (among which he reckons this flight), "καὶ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ αὐτοῦ," is one feature in his character which distinguished him from enthusiasts: 2 Cor. xi. 30.

† Three years after his conversion, namely, on the supposition that the *terminus a quo*, the years are reckoned in the passage of the Epistle to the Galatians, is the date of his conversion.

‡ This circumstance in Paul's life, furnishes one of the few chronological marks for its history. When Paul fled from Damascus three years after his conversion, that city was under the government of King Aretas of Arabia Petrea, 2 Cor. xi. 32. But since Damascus belonged to a Roman Province, Aretas must have been in possession of this city under very peculiar circumstances. Süskind in his essay in Bengel's *Archiv* 1. 2. p. 314; Wurm in his essay on the Chro-

saalem, that he might become personally acquainted with Peter, as the individual who at that time maintained the

nology of Paul's life, in the "Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie," 1833, 1st part, p. 27; and Auger, p. 161, agree in thinking, that we are not quite justified in admitting that Aretas was at that time in possession of Damascus, as it is a conclusion nowise favoured by other historical accounts; for if Damascus was then under the Roman government, the Ethnarch of Aretas might have ventured to place a watch before the gates of the city, or, through his influence with the Roman authorities, have obtained permission for the Jews to do this. Yet it is difficult to believe, that if Damascus belonged to a Roman province, the Arabian Ethnarch would venture to surround the city with a watch, in order to get the Roman citizen into his power; or that the Roman authorities would allow of his doing so, or at his request expose a Roman citizen to the wrath of the Jews. Although the history, in which there are besides so many breaks, does not inform us of such an occupancy of Damascus, yet the consideration of this passage favours this supposition. Now the circumstances by which Aretas might have gained possession of the city were probably these. The Emperor Tiberius, as the ally of King Herod Agrippa, whose army had been defeated by Aretas, commanded Vitellius, the governor of Syria, to get possession of him either dead or alive. But while Vitellius was preparing to execute these orders, and various circumstances delayed his entering on the campaign, news arrived of the Emperor's death, which took place in March of the year 37, and Vitellius was thus stopped in his military movements. Aretas might take advantage of this interval to gain possession of the city. But we must not suppose that the city thus snatched from the Romans, remained long in his hands, and it is probable that, as in the second year of the reign of the Emperor Caligula, A. D. 38-39, the affairs of Arabia were settled, Damascus also was not left unnoticed. If we place the flight of Paul from Damascus in 39, then his conversion must have been in A. D. 36, since it must have occurred three years before, and we also fix the same date for Stephen's martyrdom. From the absence of chronological information respecting the events of those times, we cannot fix with certainty the date of Paul's conversion; yet the computation which places it in A. D. 36, has this in its favour, that it allows neither too long nor short a time for the events which took place in the Christian church, from the period of Christ's Ascension, to the martyrdom of Stephen and the conversion of Paul.

highest reputation in the new church, and exercised the greatest influence in all its concerns. But as he was known at Jerusalem only as the persecutor, every one avoided him, till Barnabas, a distinguished teacher of the church, who, as a Hellenist, felt less a stranger to him, and might formerly have had some connection with him, introduced him to the rest. His Hellenistic origin occasioned his holding many conversations and disputations on Judaism and the Christian doctrine with the Hellenistic Jews.

It may be asked, whether Paul took the same ground in his controversies with his countrymen at this early period, as in later times; and this is connected with the mode of the development of his Christian convictions and doctrinal views. When he first came to the knowledge of the gospel, did he recognise at the same time its independence of the Mosaic law? To do this, must have been most difficult for one who had so lately renounced the principles of Pharisaism: for we generally find that others of this sect who embraced Christianity, attempted to combine their former tenets with those of the gospel. Ananias, the first instructor of the apostle, was universally revered on account of his legal piety; such an individual, therefore, must have been very far from wishing to effect a disruption of Christianity from the Mosaic ceremonial law. At the time of Paul's conversion, this was the tone of sentiment universally prevalent among Christians; for, as we have remarked, it was only after the martyrdom of Stephen, and owing to the results of that event, that new light on this subject from various quarters gradually broke in upon them. But we are not justified in assuming, that the same causes led Paul to the views he adopted. We cannot attribute much efficacy to influences from without, by the communication of doctrines and views, in the case of a man so distinguished for his great independent peculiarity of character. We are compelled to believe him, when he testifies so undoubtingly, that he received the gospel, in the manner he was wont to publish it, not by human instruction, but only by a communication of

the Spirit of Christ. Some exception, however, must be made in reference to the historical records, containing the discourses and precepts of Christ; with these he became acquainted through the ordinary channel of human tradition, and we find him accordingly appealing on certain occasions to such traditions, or to words uttered by the Lord.*

As Paul felt himself compelled to examine, independently of others, the depths of the truth made known by Christ, he must have thought it a matter of importance to obtain a collection of the sayings of Christ, on which all farther developments of the new doctrine must depend, and from which they must proceed. We cannot suppose that he would satisfy himself with single expressions casually obtained from oral intercourse with the apostles, whom he met so seldom, and for so short a time. Besides, he says expressly in his Epistle to the Galatians, that these interviews with the other apostles were of no service towards his acquiring a deeper insight into Christian doctrines. We are led to the supposition, that he obtained written memoirs of the life of Christ, or at least, a written collection of the sayings of Christ, if such existed, or that he compiled one himself. But it is very probable that such a collection, or several such collections, and written memoirs of Christ's ministry, were in existence; for, however highly we may estimate the power of the living word in this youthful period of the

* 1 Cor. xi. 23. On this passage, Schulz justly remarks, that Paul uses *ἔπε* not *παρὰ* to signify that what he "received" was not *immediately* but *mediately* from the Lord. What has been said by Olshausen and Meier (on different grounds) against this interpretation, has not induced me to give it up. The expression *παρελάβον ἔπε τοῦ κυρίου* is also by no means unimportant. It was not so much the apostle's design to mark the manner in which this tradition came to him, but only for what purpose it was given, to represent as certain that this was the form in which the Lord had instituted the Last Supper; hence also the repetition of the term *κυρίου* is not improper. Had Paul been speaking of a special revelation, by which this information was imparted, he would scarcely have signified it by *παρελάβον*, but rather by *ἀπεκαλύφθη*.

church, we cannot allow ourselves to forget that we are not speaking of the age of rhapsodies, but of one in which—especially wherever Grecian cultivation had found its way—historical composition was much practised. Might we not expect, then, that some memorials would be speedily committed to writing of what moved their hearts, and occupied their thoughts so intensely; although a longer time might elapse before any one resolved to attempt a delineation of the whole life of Christ? * Many allusions to expressions of Christ in the

* Eusebius narrates (v. 10), probably in consequence of information derived from Pansenus, that the apostle Bartholomew had communicated to the so-called Indians to whom he published the gospel, a Hebrew original document of the Evangelical History drawn up by Matthew, which account we are plainly not justified to call in question. This original document may indeed be the same which Papias entitles (Eusebius, iii. 39) *συναξις τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου*. And I should by no means object to understanding this to be a collection of the Discourses of the Lord—for it is in itself very probable that such a compilation would be early made, as a store of materials for the development of Christian doctrine—if what he had before said of Mark's writings did not intimate that he meant both the discourses and actions of Christ; for I cannot, with Schneckenburger, trace the distinction, that Mark had compiled a report of the discourses and actions of Christ, but Matthew only of his discourses. In this case, Papias would have laid the emphasis on *λόγους*, and have said *τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου συναξις*; but now the emphasis rests on the word *συναξις*, an orderly collection, not mere insulated fragments; (note to 2d edition). To this 3d edition, I must add, in limitation of what I have here said, and of what Dr Lucke has said before me in the "Studien und Kritiken," 1833, p. 501, certainly the emphasis rests upon the word *συναξις*, as contrasted with a rhapsodical description; it may be intended that Papias wished to contrast the work of Mark as a rhapsodical collection of the actions and discourses of Christ, with the work of Matthew as an arranged collection of the sayings of the Lord alone. Lastly, he says this only in a secondary sense of Mark. The words peculiarly apply to Peter, from whose discourses Mark must have borrowed the materials and the form of his work. Of Peter, he says, *ὡς καὶ χάρις ἰσχυρὸς καὶ διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅστις συναξεν τῶν κηρύκων ἀκουσμένους λόγους*. Peter had composed his addresses ac-

Pauline Epistles, besides his direct quotations of Christ's words, point to such a collection of his discourses, of which the apostle availed himself,* and probably Marcion, who owned no inspired authority besides Paul, had heard of such a compilation of the memoirs of Christ, made use of by his favourite apostle, and attempted by his criticisms on Luke's writings, which were not altogether to his mind, to find out what he considered as Pauline.† Thus the words of Christ given by tradition,

cording to the wants of his hearers at the time, and not with the intention of giving an orderly account of the discourses or sayings of Christ. For this reason, Mark, who drew all his information from these addresses, could compile nothing of that kind. The words of Papias are therefore rather favourable than unfavourable to the supposition, that the original work of Matthew was only a collection of the sayings of Christ, as Schleiermacher maintained. As to Bartholomew's taking such a document with him for his mission, something similar may have occurred with other preachers of the gospel, whether Paul obtained the same document or another. The Judaizing tendency of the document derived from Matthew, alleged by many, by no means prevents me from admitting this; it contains expressions which, by Ebionites cleaving to the letter, might be interpreted according to their mind; but in which Paul, who penetrated deeper into the spirit, would find an entirely different idea.—See *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 9, 131, 140.

* *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 157, 238, 241, 474.

† "It is certain that he (Marcion) acknowledged only the Epistles of Paul, and an original gospel which, by a mistake, he believed that he had found quoted by Paul as the genuine sources of Christian knowledge. But as he proceeded on the fixed idea, that these ancient records no longer existed in their original state, but had been falsified by the Judaism whose image often haunted him like a spectre, he attempted by means of an arbitrary criticism to restore them to their original form. His supposed original gospel made use of by Paul, was a mutilation of the Gospel of Luke. His criticism was so far from logical, that several things were allowed to remain, which could only be brought into agreement with Marcion's system by a forced interpretation and a violation of genuine Hermeneutics." Dr Neander in his "*Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Religion und Kirche*." Vol. i. p. 802. [Tr.]

were the foundation for the continued development of Christian doctrine, to which, independently of all other instructions, the illumination of the Holy Spirit led the apostles. And we can easily make it apparent, that many of the deep truths expressed by him, for example, in reference to the relation of the law to the gospel, unfolded themselves to his view, from hints pregnant with meaning,* given by Christ himself.† Nor can we form any other judgment respecting him as a Christian teacher, than that he, by the Spirit of Christ, understood the words of Christ made known to him by tradition, in all their depth of meaning, and thus learnt to develop the hidden fulness of divine truth which they contained.

Certainly for those who *gradually* past over to Christianity from Pharisaic Judaism, a considerable time might elapse before the spirit of Christianity could divest itself of the Pharisaic form. But it was otherwise with Paul, in whom Pharisaism had exhibited the most unsparing opposition to the gospel, and who, without any such gradual transition, had been seized at a critical moment by the power of the gospel, and from being its most violent enemy, had become its most zealous confessor; that Paul who, as he describes it in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, after the sense of slavery had been excited to the utmost intensity in his bosom, was at once transported into a state of freedom, by believing in the Redeemer. The bonds of Pharisaism were in his case loosened instantaneously; in his mind opposition against Pharisaic Judaism, took the place of opposition against the gospel, as he says of himself (Philippians iii. 8), that for Christ's sake, he had suffered the loss of all those things which he once prized, and all that once appeared to him so splendid, "he counted but as dung," that he might win Christ.

* It will be evident that I do not mean to say, what Christ himself possessed as the fulness of meaning; but what presented itself to him who received it with a susceptible disposition, as a germ of a new spiritual creation.

† *Das Leben Jesu*, 133, 395, 431, 465.

Thus from the beginning, by the illumination of the Spirit alone, and according to the guidance of Christ's words, he had been taught, in all its freedom and depth, the genius of the gospel in relation to Judaism, without having his views modified by the influence of Peter,* and those Christians of Hellenistic descent, who had already preached the gospel among the Gentiles. It was in consequence of this, that Paul (since, like his precursor Stephen, he more freely developed evangelical truth under this aspect in disputations with the Hellenists) excited so strongly the indignation of the Jews. On the other hand, the prospect opened to him of a wider sphere of action among heathen nations. As he was one day in the Temple, and by prayer lifting up his soul to the Lord, he was borne aloft from earthly things. In a

* That is, on the supposition that the conversion of Cornelius had already taken place, which, taking into account its connection with other events, is most probable. The interest which the conversion of Cornelius and his family excited at Jerusalem, and the manner of Peter's reception there, it would not be easy to explain, if they had already been made acquainted with the effects of Christianity among the Gentiles at Antioch. On the contrary, it is by no means apparent from the mission of Barnabas to Antioch (Acts xi. 22), that they had still so decided a scruple against the reception of believing Gentiles into the Christian church. It would agree very well with the disposition they manifested on that occasion, if we suppose that, by the example of Cornelius and his family, and by the influence of Peter, they had been induced to give up their decided opposition. But they might wish to convince themselves by the investigations of an apostolic man, that every thing was right in this church, consisting for the most part of Gentile Christians. Even when they had adopted more liberal views on this subject, still there might be so much of their former feeling left, that they could not place the same confidence in a church founded among the Gentiles as in one among the Jews. Though it is possible that they sent so able a teacher thither, not from any feeling of distrust, but for the establishment and furtherance of the work already begun; and chose a Hellenist as better fitted to publish the gospel among people of Grecian descent. Auger's remarks, in his work already quoted, p. 188, have occasioned an alteration in my former views.

vision he received an assurance from the Lord, that though he would be able to effect nothing at Jerusalem, on account of the animosity of the Jews, he was destined to carry the doctrine of salvation to other nations, even in remote regions; Acts xxii. 21. Accordingly, after staying in Jerusalem not more than fourteen days, he was obliged to leave it, through the machinations of the Jews. He now returned to his native place, Tarsus, where he spent several years, certainly not in inactivity; for by his labours the gospel was spread among both Jews and Gentiles in Tarsus and throughout Cilicia; there is good reason for believing, that to him the Gentile churches, which in a short time we find in Cilicia, owed their origin.*

* The silence of the Acts respecting the labours of Paul in Cilicia, cannot be brought as evidence against the fact, for the account it gives of this period has many *lacunæ*. From the manner in which Paul is mentioned as secondary to Barnabas, till the time of their first missionary journey, an argument might be drawn for his not having previously entered on any independent sphere of labour. But the case may be, that though Paul, as the younger and less known, was at first spoken of as subordinate to Barnabas, the elder and approved publisher of the gospel; yet, by degrees, Paul's extraordinary exertions gave a different aspect to their relative position. In Jerusalem they continued for a longer time to assign the priority to Barnabas, as appears from the apostolic Epistle in Acts xv. 25, a circumstance which Bleek very justly adduces as a mark of the unaltered originality of this document; v. *Studien und Kritiken* 1836, part iv. p. 1037. At all events, one would rather assign a date some years later to the conversion of Paul, (on which too, we can never come to a decisive conclusion,) than suppose that he could spend several years in his native place without exerting himself for the propagation of Christianity,—he who solemnly declares, that, from the time of his conversion, he felt so strongly the impulse of an inward call to preach the gospel.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH AT ANTIOCH THE GENTILE MOTHER-CHURCH,
AND ITS RELATION TO THE JEWISH MOTHER-CHURCH.

IN the mean time, as we have already remarked, Christianity was propagated among the Gentiles by Hellenist teachers in Antioch, the metropolis of Eastern Roman Asia. The news of this event excited great interest among the Christians at Jerusalem. It is true, the information was not received in exactly the same manner as it would have been, if the account of the operation of Christianity among the Gentiles in the conversion of Cornelius had not materially contributed to allay their prejudices. But still a measure of mistrust was prevalent against the Gentile believers who were non-observant of the Mosaic law, a feeling which, after many repeated exhibitions of the divine power of the gospel among Gentile Christians, lingered for a long time in the majority of Jewish believers. On this account, Barnabas, a teacher who stood high in the general confidence, and who as a Hellenist was better fitted to deal with Christians of the same class, was commissioned to visit the new Gentile converts. On his arrival he rejoiced in witnessing the genuine effects of the gospel, and used his utmost endeavours to advance the work. The extensive prospect which opened here for the advancement of the kingdom of God, occasioned his inviting Paul, who had been active among the Gentiles in Cilicia, to become his fellow-labourer. One evidence of the power with which Christianity in an independent manner spread itself among the Gentiles, was the new name of Christians which was here given to believers. Among themselves they were called, the Disciples of the Lord, the Disciples of Jesus, the Brethren, the Believers. By the Jews names were imposed upon them which implied undervaluation or contempt, such as the Galileans, the Nazarenes, the Paupers; and Jews would of course not give them a name

meaning the adherents of the Messiah. The Gentiles had hitherto, on account of their observance of the ceremonial law, not known how to distinguish them from Jews. But now, when Christianity was spread among the Gentiles apart from the observance of the ceremonial law, its professors appeared as an entirely new religious sect (a *genus tertium*, as they were sometimes termed, being neither Jews nor Gentiles); and as the term Christ was held to be a proper name, the adherents of the new religious teacher were distinguished by a word formed from it, as the adherents of any school of philosophy were wont to be named after its founder.

Antioch from this time occupied a most important place in the propagation of Christianity, for which there were now two central points; what Jerusalem had hitherto been for this purpose among the Jews, that Antioch now became among the Gentiles. Here first the two representations of Christianity, distinguished from one another by the predominance of the Jewish or Gentile element, came into collision. As at Alexandria at a later period, the development of Christianity had to experience the effect of various mixtures of the ancient oriental modes of thinking with the mental cultivation of the Grecian schools, so in this Roman metropolis of Eastern Asia, it met with various mixtures of the oriental forms of religious belief. From Antioch, at the beginning of the second century, proceeded the system of an oriental-anti-Jewish Gnosis, which opposed Christianity to Judaism.

As there was considerable intercourse between the two churches at Jerusalem and Antioch, Christian teachers frequently came from the former to the latter; among these was a prophet named Agabus, who prophesied of an approaching famine, which would be felt severely by a great number of poor Christians in Jerusalem, and he called upon the believers in Antioch to assist their poorer brethren. This famine actually occurred in Palestine about A. D. 44.*

* We cannot fix the exact time when this famine began. It is

The faculty of foretelling a future event, did not necessarily enter into the New Testament idea of a prophet, if we assume that Luke wrote from his own standing-point. An address fitted to produce a powerful effect on an audience, one by which Christians would be excited to deeds of beneficence, would agree with the marks of a prophetic address in the New Testament sense; but as in the Acts it is expressly added, that the famine foretold by the prophet actually came to pass; we must doubtless admit, in this instance, that there was a prediction of an impending famine, although it is possible that the prophecy was founded on the observation of natural prognostics.

The Christians at Antioch felt themselves bound to assist in its temporal distress, that church from which they had received the highest spiritual benefits, and probably sent their contributions before the beginning of the famine, by the hands of Paul and Barnabas, to the presiding elders of the church at Jerusalem. This church, after enjoying about eight years' peace, since the persecution that ensued on Stephen's martyrdom, was once more assailed by a violent but transient tempest. King Herod Agrippa, to whom the Emperor Claudius had granted the government of Judea, affected great zeal for the strict observance of the ancient ritual,* although on many occasions he acted contrary to it, on purpose to ingratiate him-

mentioned by Josephus in his Antiq. book xx. ch. 2 § 5. It was so great that numbers died in it from want. Queen Helena of Adiabene in Syria, a convert to Judaism, sent a vessel laden with corn, which she had purchased at Alexandria, and with figs procured in the island of Cyprus, to Jerusalem, and caused these provisions to be distributed among the poor. Luke, indeed, speaks of a famine that spread itself over the whole *kosmos*, which was not the case with this. To understand by *kosmos* in this passage, Palestine only, is not justified by the New Testament phraseology; but, it is possible that the famine extended to other parts, and, we must then suppose the word to be used somewhat rhetorically, and not with literal exactness, especially if we consider it as spoken by a prophet come from Jerusalem.

* Josephus, Antiq. book xix. ch. 6 and 7.

self with the Gentiles, just as by his zeal for Judaism, he tried to attach the Jewish people to himself. Actuated by such motives, he thought it expedient to manifest hostility to the teachers of the new doctrine, of whom he had received unfavourable reports. He caused James the son of Zebedee, and a brother of the apostle John, who probably, by some particular act or discourse, had excited the anger of the Jewish zealots, to be put to death; and during the Passover in the year 44,* he cast Peter into prison, intending that he should meet with the same fate after the feast. But by the special providence of God, Peter was delivered from prison, and the death of the king which shortly followed, once more gave peace to the church.

If Paul and Barnabas arrived at Jerusalem during this disturbed state of things, their stay was necessarily shortened by it, and they could accomplish nothing of consequence.† But if we compare the account in the Acts, with the narrative of the apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, and if we assume that the journey to Jerusalem, which he there mentions as the second, was really the second, this journey would acquire great importance.‡ We must then assume, that although

* For it was the last year of Herod Agrippa's reign, who held for at least three whole years the sovereignty of Judea, (Joseph. xix. 8. 2); and, therefore, certainly reigned from the end of January 41, to the beginning of the reign of Claudius, the end of January 44; so that only the Passover of this last year could be intended, that which took place after Herod had reigned three whole years.

† As the words *καὶ ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν*, in Acts xii. 1, cannot serve for fixing the exact date, the coincidence of this journey of Paul's with the events at Jerusalem, and the whole chronology founded upon it of the apostle's history, is not absolutely certain. Yet there is no valid argument against this arrangement.

‡ Irenæus adv. hæres. Lib. iii. c. 13, seems to consider it as settled that this was Paul's third journey. But what Tertullian says (contra Marcion i. 20), goes on the supposition that it was his second journey. He alleges the same reason for thinking so, as Keil, in his essay on the subject lately

the conveyance of the collection to Jerusalem was the avowed object and motive of this journey,—yet Paul himself had another and more important end in view, which probably induced him to be the bearer of the contributions. As the strictly Pharisaical Jews held it ab-

published in his *Opuscula*; that Paul, in the first glow of his conversion, was more violent against Judaism, but latterly his feelings towards it were mollified. Thus he explains the dispute with Peter at Antioch. “*Paulus adhuc in gratia rudis, ferventer ut adhuc neophytus adversus Judaismum.*” (It is contradictory to this supposition that he allows Paul to have given way to the Judaizers at Jerusalem, in reference to the circumcision of Titus, *con. Marcion*, v. 3); and it would entirely correspond with the character of Paul and the mode of his conversion, that, at first, he should engage in fiercer opposition to the observance of the law, than that his mind should gradually be developed in that freer direction. Yet this supposition, as we shall afterwards shew, is by no means supported by historical evidence. What is advanced by Wurm, in his essay already quoted, in the Tübingen “*Zeitschrift für Theologie*,” against my application of the first passage from Tertullian, is not correct. I have here remarked on the contradiction between the two passages, and in a writer of Tertullian’s cast of mind—highly as we esteem the depth, fire, and vigour of his genius—such a contradiction is not very surprising.—But from Tertull. c. Marcion, lib. v. 2, 3, it is by no means clear, that he considered the second journey mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, as the same with that which was followed by the resolutions of the apostolic assembly at Jerusalem. Tertullian only says, that the Acts of the Apostles—whose credibility was not acknowledged by Marcion—represented the principles on which Paul acted, not differently from what Paul states them to be in an Epistle admitted as genuine by Marcion; consequently, the account of Luke, in this respect, must be credible. So, then, Tertullian, i. 9, by *rudis fides* means the same as in the passage first quoted. The *rudis fides* in that passage, is a faith still young and not fully tried, which hence could not possess so independent an authority; “*hoc enim* (the temporary concession in reference to the circumcision of Titus) *rudis fidei et adhuc de legis observatione suspensæ* (in reference to which it was still disputed whether they were not bound to the observance of the law) *competebat*,” namely, until Paul had succeeded in having his independent call to the apostleship and its peculiar grounds, acknowledged by the other apostles.

solutely necessary for the Gentiles to submit to the whole ceremonial law, and particularly to circumcision,* in order to enjoy the blessings of theocracy; as the mistrust of the Jewish Christians had already, as we have before remarked, manifested itself against the Gentile converts; and as the consequences of this state of feeling might have already appeared in the church at Antioch, which stood in so close a connection with the parent church at Jerusalem; it is not at all improbable, that Paul and Barnabas felt it to be their imperative duty, in order to guard against a dangerous disagreement, to come to an understanding with the apostles at Jerusalem on this subject, and to unite with them in establishing fixed principles respecting it. Yet in itself it is more probable, that such a mutual explanation took place earlier, than that it occurred at so late a period.† Such a conference of Paul and Barnabas with the three most eminent of the apostles, could not well be held at that time, since one of them was cast into prison; but too great an uncertainty is attached to the dates of these events, to render this objection of much weight. And it agrees with the existing circumstances of the church, that this conference is represented as a private transaction of Paul's with the most eminent of the apostles;‡

* A Jewish merchant, named Ananias, who had converted King Izates of Adiabene, the son of Queen Helena, to Judaism, assured him that he might worship Jehovah without being circumcised, and even sought to dissuade him from it, that it might not cause an insurrection of his people. But when another stricter Jew, Eleazar, came thither, he declared to the king that since he acknowledged the divine authority of the Mosaic law, he would sin by neglecting any of its commands, and therefore no consideration ought to prevent his compliance. Joseph. Archæol. lib. xx. c. 2, § 4. And such was the opinion of the converts to Christianity from among the Jews, who, to use the words of Josephus, were ἀπειθεῖς τοῖς καὶ νόμοις.

† As Dr Paulus remarks in his Exegetical Manual, i. 1, p. 238.

‡ The *πρὸς Ἰερουζαλὴμ*, Gal. ii. 2, which contains an antithesis to *ἐκ κοινῆς*. Yet public conferences are by no means ex-

partly because the matter did not appear sufficiently ripe for a public discussion; partly because, by the persecution set on foot by King Agrippa, the intended public conference might be prevented. By this supposition, we therefore gain a connecting link in the history of the transactions between the Jewish and Gentile converts, and thus the two historical documents, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Galatians, serve to supply what is necessary for the completion of each. But, in the first place, the chronology of the common reading, supported by the authority of all the manuscripts,* is irreconcilable with this hypothesis, for we must reckon Paul's conversion to have taken place fourteen years earlier, which would be a computation wholly untenable. And, secondly, the relation in which Paul, according to the description in the Acts, stood at any given time to Barnabas, the elder preacher of the gospel, will not agree with this view. For at an earlier period, accord-

cluded; for it is not clear that the words *non' dñs* follow what was before said merely as a limiting explanatory clause. Paul, perhaps, might not except some special topic of importance from the *ἀνδρῶν ἀβραῖς* (which must principally relate to his Christian brethren in Jerusalem),—his private conferences with James, Peter, and John; or he might design to notice only the public, and afterwards the important private conferences, altogether passing over the former. Compare Wurm. p. 51; Auger, p. 149.

* The *Chronicon Paschale Alexandrinum*, ed. Niebuhr, p. 436, certainly forms an exception, according to which Paul took this second journey *four* years after his conversion; and this computation supposes the reading to be *τεσσαρὶς ἔτεσιν*, instead of *δωδεκῆ*. Such a reading being assumed, we may easily understand how 12 was formed from 4. And according to this reading, if we refer it to the second journey of Paul mentioned in the Acts, every thing will readily agree with such a computation; only, if we reckon these four years from the conversion of St Paul, that event must be placed about the year 40. But still it remains uncertain, whether the computation in the *Chronicon Paschale* is founded on a critical conjecture, or on the authority of a manuscript; and, at all events, the opposing evidence of all manuscripts and quotations from the Fathers is too important.

ing to the slight notices furnished us by the Acts, Paul appears in a subordinate relation, both of age and disciplinship, to the elder preacher of the gospel. It was not till he undertook the missionary journey with Barnabas from Antioch, in which he was the most prominent agent, that that apostolic superiority developed itself, which was afterwards exhibited in the transactions at Jerusalem. Still we cannot consider this remark as decisive of the question; for we may feel confident that such a man as Paul, especially if we grant his independent labours in Cilicia—must have come forward, even before the period of his apostolic superiority, with extraordinary efficiency when the occasion demanded it.

Since there was no deficiency of teachers in the church at Antioch, we may presume that, after the conversion of the Gentiles had once begun, the publication of the gospel would be extended from Syria to other heathen nations. Barnabas and Paul had probably at an early period expressed their desire to be employed in a wider sphere for the conversion of the Gentiles, as Paul had been assured by the Lord of his appointment to carry the gospel to distant nations. And as Barnabas had brought his nephew Mark with him from Jerusalem to Antioch, it is not unlikely that he was prompted to this step by the prospect of a more extensive field in which he might employ his relation as a fellow-labourer. The teachers who were assembled at Antioch appointed a day of fasting and prayer, to lay this matter before the Lord, and to pray for his illumination to direct them what to do. A firm persuasion was imparted to them all by the Spirit of God, that they ought to set apart and send forth Barnabas and Paul to the work to which they were called by the Lord.

CHAPTER III.

THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY FROM ANTIOCH BY
PAUL AND BARNABAS.

ACCOMPANIED by Mark, they first visited the island of Cyprus, the native country of Barnabas, whose ancient connection with it facilitated the introduction of the gospel. They traversed the island from east to west, from Salamis to Paphos. In their teaching they followed the track which history had marked out for them, that method by which the gospel must spread itself among the heathen. As the Jews, in virtue of their connection with the theocratic development, and of the promises entrusted to them, had the first claim to the announcement of the Messiah;* as they were in a

* *πρώτοι Ἰουδαῖοι*, Rom. i. 16, compared with John iv. 22. The credibility of what is narrated in the Acts on this and other occasions, respecting the manner in which Paul turned to the Gentiles, immediately after the ill reception which he met with from the Jews assembled in the synagogue, would be shaken, if Dr Bauer were correct in his assertion, (see his *Essay on the Object and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans*, in the *Tubingen Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1836, part iii. p. 101), that the author of the Acts did not give a faithful relation of objective facts, but modified them according to his peculiar views and design; that this is to be explained from the apologetical design with which he maintains the position, that the gospel reached the Gentiles only through the criminality and unbelief of the Jews. This is connected with Bauer's idea of an anti-pauline party, consisting of persons who took offence at the Pauline universalism (his preaching the gospel both to Jews and Gentiles), and which had its seat at Rome. For this party, such an apologetic representation of Paul's ministry must be designed. We might be allowed to cast such a suspicion on the representations in the Acts, if any thing artificial was to be found in them, any thing not corresponding to what might be expected from the circumstances of the times. But if the line of conduct ascribed to the apostle, and its consequences, appear altogether natural

state of the greatest preparation, and places already existed among them for the purposes of religious instruc-

under the circumstances, it does not appear how we can be justified in deducing the repetition (of Paul's mode of acting) grounded in the nature of the thing, not from that, but from the subjective manner of the narrator. Now, in all the cities where synagogues existed, they formed the most convenient places for making known the gospel, when Paul was not disposed to appear in the public market-places as a preacher. Here he found the proselytes assembled, who formed a channel of communication with the Gentiles. And in the passage quoted from the Epistle to the Romans, the principle is stated according to which the Jews had the first claim to the publication of the gospel. Love to his own people produced the earnest desire to effect as much as possible for their salvation, along with his calling as an apostle of the Gentiles, Rom. xi. 13. That I have brought forward this from the Epistle to the Romans, which Bauer has made use of as a proof of the existence of such an apologetic interest, is not on my part a mere *petitio principii*; for I cannot in any way reconcile it with the character of the apostle, that he could express such principles and such desires merely from motives of expediency. But it was natural that he should turn away from the great mass of the carnally-minded Jews, if he found only here and there individuals among them of susceptible dispositions, and devote himself to the Gentiles alone. It does not follow from this, that his call to the apostleship among the heathen was determined merely by accidental circumstances; for if he found a greater number of Jews in a city disposed to believe, yet his other calling would not thereby have been frustrated; but among the converted Hellenistic Jews, who were more closely related to those who were Greeks by birth or education, he would have found assistance for establishing the Christian church among the Gentiles. And when, after so many painful experiences, he had little hopes of success among the Jews, still he could not give up the attempt to do something for his countrymen, if by any means he might save some; especially since he could so well unite this with the interests of his calling, and could find no more convenient and unostentatious method of paving his way to the Gentiles. And does not the peculiar mixture in the churches of Gentile-Christians, the influence of Judaizers upon them, give evidence of their origination? Rom. xi. 12 will also establish this point. And that the author of the Acts has given a narrative consistent with facts and the actual state of things, is

tion; it was on these accounts natural that the apostles should first enter the synagogues, and the proselytes of the gate, whom they here met with, afforded them the most convenient point of transition from the Jews to the Gentiles. In Paphos, they found in the Proconsul Sergius Paulus, a man dissatisfied with all that philosophy and the popular religion could offer for his religious wants, and anxious to receive every thing which presented itself as a new communication from heaven; hence, he was eager to hear what Paul and Barnabas announced as a new divine doctrine. But, owing to that sense of religious need, unsatisfied by any clear knowledge, he had given ear to the deceptive arts of an itinerant Jewish Goës, Barjesus. These Goëtæ were in succeeding times* the most virulent opposers of Christianity, because it threatened to deprive them of their domination over the minds of men;† and for the same reason, this man took the utmost pains to hinder the spread of the gospel, and to prejudice the Proconsul against it. But Paul, full of holy indignation, declared with divine confidence, that the Lord would punish him with the loss of that eyesight which he only abused, by attempting with his arts

shewn by this, that, when describing the entrance of Paul at Athens, he does not repeat the same method of proceeding, but represents him as acting in a different manner, adapted to the local peculiarities. Throughout the Acts, I can perceive no traces of any thing but an historical object, which the author has pursued according to the means of information within his reach.

* On this account, it was not at all uncommon for such sorcerers to find access to men of the highest rank. Thus Lucian narrates, that the most distinguished men in Rome most eagerly inquired after the prophecies of a sorcerer, Alexander of Abonateichos, in Pontus, who acquired great notoriety in the reign of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius; among the zealous adherents of Alexander, he mentions especially an eminent Roman statesman, Rutilianus, of whom he says—*ἄνθρωπος τῷ μὲν ἄλλῃ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς πράξεσι χρηματικαῖς ἱκανότατος, τῷ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς παντὶ νοσήν.* Lucian. Alexand. § 30.

† Of which the Alexander mentioned in the preceding note is an example.

of deception, to stop the progress of divine truth. The threatening was immediately fulfilled; and by this sensible evidence of the operation of a higher power, the Proconsul was withdrawn from the influence of the Goths, and rendered more susceptible of divine instruction.

Thence they directed their course farther northward; passed over to Pamphylia, and along the borders of Phrygia, Isauria, and Pisidia, and made a longer stay at the considerable city of Antioch* (which as a border-city, was at different periods reckoned as belonging to different provinces), in order to allow time for making known the gospel. Paul's discourse in the synagogue is a specimen of the peculiar wisdom and skill of the great apostle in the management of men's dispositions, and of his peculiar antithetical mode of developing Christian truth. He sought first to win the attention and confidence of his hearers, by reminding them how God had chosen their fathers to be his people, and then gave an outline of God's dealings with them, to the times of David, the individual from whose posterity, according to the promises, the Messiah was to spring. After the introduction he came to the main object of his address, to the appearance of the Messiah, and to what he had effected for the salvation of mankind. Then turning to the Jews and proselytes present, he proceeded to say, that for them this announcement of salvation was designed, since those to whom it was first proposed, the Jews at Jerusalem, and their rulers, had been unwilling to receive it; they had not acknowledged the Messiah, nor understood the prophecies, which they heard read every Sabbath-day in their synagogues.† Yet, while in their blindness, they condemned the Messiah to death, they could not retard the fulfilment of the prophecies, but against their design and will, contributed to it; for after

* To distinguish it from the Asiatic metropolis, it is called *Antiochia apud Pisidiam*.

† Only using milder expressions, Paul here says the same things of the blindness of the Jews, which he often says in stronger and more severe language in his Epistles, accusing them of obduracy.

he had suffered all things which according to the predictions of the prophets he was to suffer, he rose from the dead. By faith in him they could obtain forgiveness of sins and justification, which they could never have obtained by the law.* And after announcing this promise to them, Paul closed with a threatening warning to unbelievers. This discourse, uttered with all the impressiveness of firm faith, and yet evincing so much tenderness towards the Jews, made at first a favourable impression upon them, and, in the name of the whole assembly, they requested him to expound his doctrine more fully on the next Sabbath.† Such was the im-

* To justify my views of this passage, I must make a few remarks on the right interpretation of Acts xiii. 39. I cannot so understand it as if the apostle meant to say—Through Christ men obtain forgiveness of *all* sins, even of *those* of which forgiveness could not be obtained through the law. The apostle certainly knew only one forgiveness of sins and one justification; and he used the term *ἁρτις* only to mark the completeness of the removal of guilt, as the idea of *δικαιοσύνη* presupposes this; but the preceding *ἁρτις*, to refer the relative pronoun by a kind of logical attraction to this term of universality, rather than to the whole idea of *δικαιοσύνη*, which he had especially in view. What Meyer says in his commentary in defence of the common interpretation, does not convince me. "Paul," he remarks, "specifies one part of the universal *ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτιῶν* as particularly worthy of notice, but this does not at all injure the unity of the forgiveness of sins and justification." I do not perceive how Paul, from his point of view, could render one special part more prominent than another; I know indeed of *no* sin from which a man could be justified on the standing-point of the law; in Paul's mind, there could be here no difference whatever. The peculiarly Pauline style of carrying out the opposition between faith and the law here appears in the germ.

† If, in Acts xiii. 42, we take *μεταξὺ* in its usual acceptation, we must understand the passage thus: Paul and Barnabas were requested to explain the Christian doctrine to them during the week between this and the next Sabbath, therefore before the next celebration of the Sabbath. Such a request would be very suitable, if we understand it as that of individuals who wished to hear discourses on the doctrine in their private circles during the week. But it does not appear so

pression made by his words on the assembly in general. But there were many among the Jews present, and especially the proselytes, who were more deeply affected than the rest by the power of truth, and who longed after the redemption announced by Paul. They could not wait till the next Sabbath, but hastened after Paul, who had left the synagogue with Barnabas; they informed them of the impressions they had received, and earnestly requested more ample instruction. Paul and Barnabas consequently availed themselves of many opportunities to explain the divine doctrine in private houses during the course of the week, and likewise to

proper as a wish expressed by the whole congregation at the synagogue. We should most naturally refer it to the Gentiles, and on that account must consider the reading $\tau\alpha\ \iota\theta\eta$ in the 42d verse as correct, though it has the appearance of a gloss. Also the word $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ in the Acts is never used in the sense of a week; for the phrase $\mu\epsilon\tau\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ cannot be brought as a voucher for this meaning. But if we understand $\tau\omicron\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$, of the next Sabbath, all will be clear; and a comparison with verse 44 favours this interpretation, which is also sanctioned by the ancient glosses and scholia in Griesbach and Matthai. From the earlier Greek writers, it is certainly difficult to find an authority for this meaning of $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\upsilon$, but not from the later. In Plutarch's *Instituta Laconica*, c. 42, $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\upsilon$ occurs twice in this sense, and especially in the second passage, $\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \text{Μακεδονικοῖς βασιλεῦσι}$ ("the Macedonian kings after Philip and Alexander,") for it cannot be otherwise understood; and so likewise in Josephus, *De Bello Jud.* lib. v. c. 4, § 2, where, after speaking of David and Solomon, he says, $\tau\omega\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota$, which can only mean, "the kings after these."—I consider the words $\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omega\ \iota\omega\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$ and the words $\tau\alpha\ \iota\theta\eta$ as glosses, founded on a misunderstanding; but I cannot, with Kuinoel, take the whole of the verse, so strongly accredited as genuine, to be only a gloss. What is said in this verse, may be considered as marking the vivid representation of an event by an eye-witness. As Paul and Barnabas were going away before the whole of the congregation had separated, they were requested by the elders of the synagogue to repeat their addresses on the next Sabbath. But after the whole congregation had separated, many individuals ran after them to open their hearts to them more unreservedly.

make it known among the Gentiles. Hence, by the next Sabbath, the new doctrine of salvation had obtained notoriety through the whole city, and a multitude of the Gentile inhabitants flocked to the synagogue in order to hear Paul's discourse. This was a spectacle sufficient to stir up the wrath of the Jews, who were filled with spiritual pride, and a delusive notion of their superiority as members of the ancient theocracy, and hence this discourse of Paul's was not heard with the same favourable disposition and calmness as the first. He was interrupted by violent contradictions and reproaches. He then declared to them, that since they were not disposed to receive the salvation announced to them, and excluded themselves from it to their own condemnation, the preachers of the gospel had discharged their obligations, and would now turn to the Gentiles, who had shewn themselves disposed to receive their instructions, and that the gospel was designed to be a fountain of light and salvation to nations in the uttermost parts of the earth. Thus Paul and Barnabas left the synagogue with the believing Gentiles, and a suitable chamber in the dwelling of one of their number, probably was the first place of assembling for the church that was now formed. Christianity spread itself through the whole circumjacent district; but the Jews contrived, by means of the female proselytes belonging to the most respectable families in the city,* and their influence on their husbands, to raise a persecution against Paul and Barnabas, so that they were obliged to leave the place. They proceeded to the city of Iconium, about ten miles to the East; in Lycaonia,† where they had access to both Jews and Gentiles. But by the influence of the hostility disposed among the former, who also here had gained over to their side a part of the people and the magistrates, they were driven from this city also. They

* Here as at Damascus (and other instances might be mentioned) Judaism found most acceptance with females, as Christianity did afterwards.

† In other times it was considered as belonging to Phrygia or Pisidia.

now betook themselves to other cities in the same province, and first tarried in the neighbouring town of Lys-tra. As in this place there was no synagogue, and scarcely any Jews dwelt in it; they could make known the gospel only by entering into conversation* in places of public resort, and thus leading persons to religious subjects; gradually small groups were formed, which were increased by many, who were attracted by curiosity or interest in the subject of conversation. Paul was one day thus instructing in divine truth a company who had gathered round him, when a man who had been lame from his birth, and probably was used to sit for alms in a thoroughfare of the city, listened to him with great attention. The Divine in the appearance and discourse of Paul deeply impressed him, and caused him to look up with confidence as if he expected a cure from him. When Paul noticed this, he said to him with a loud voice, "Stand upright on thy feet;" and he stood up and walked.†

This sight attracted a still larger crowd, and the credulous people now esteemed the two apostles to be more than men,—gods, who had come down in human form to confer benefits on men. A belief of this kind, deeply seated in the human breast, and proceeding from the undeniable feeling of the connection of the human race with God, was spread from ancient times among the heathen,‡ and at that period was much increased by the ex-

* A frequent practice of modern missionaries in Asia.

† Only *he* will feel compelled to believe this who acknowledges the new divine powers of life, which through Christ have been introduced to the human race. But whoever is not entangled in a mechanical view of nature, whoever acknowledges the power of Spirit over nature, and a hidden dynamic connection between soul and body—to such a person it cannot appear wholly incredible that the immediate impression of a divine power operating on the whole internal being of man, should produce results of altogether a different kind from remedies taken out of the stores of the ordinary powers of nature.

‡ The Homeric *ἄνθρωποι θεοὶ ἀλλοδαποῖσι, Πανταῖσι τιλε-
σονται, πιστοφῶσι πολλῆς*. Od. *ε*. 485.

isting religious ferment. Now in this city Zeus was worshipped as the founder of cities, as the originator, guide, and protector of civilization,* as the founder and protector of this city in particular (*Zeus πολίτης, πολιεύχης*), and a temple at the entrance of the city was dedicated to him.† Accordingly the people imagined that their tutelary deity, Zeus himself, had come down to them; and as Paul was foremost in speaking, and possessed—as we may conclude from his Epistles, and his speech at Athens—a peculiarly powerful address, and a high degree of popular eloquence, he was taken for Hermes, while Barnabas his senior, who perhaps had something imposing in his appearance, was believed to be Zeus. The people made their remarks to one another on these strangers in the old Lycaonian dialect, so that Paul and Barnabas were not aware of their drift, and were therefore quite unprepared for the result. The news of the appearance of these supposed divinities quickly reached the temple, and a priest came with oxen, which were generally sacrificed to Zeus, and with garlands to adorn them, to the gates of the city;‡ whether he wished to sacrifice to

* As Aristides in his discourse *in Διον* says, that as Zeus is the creator and giver of all good things, he is to be worshipped under manifold titles according to these various relations. Παιδ' ὅσα αὐτοῖς εἶσι μεγάλα καὶ ἱερὰ ἀποτίνα ἵερα.

† Libanius *ὅτι τῶν ἱερῶν*, ed. Reiske, vol. ii. p. 158, remarks, that cities were built in the immediate vicinity of temples, hence frequently the buildings nearest the walls were ancient temples; as in the Middle Ages, the site of towns was often determined by that of the churches and religious houses, and as in our own times in the South Sea Islands, settlements are formed near the residence of the missionaries, which gradually become villages and towns.

‡ The word *πολῶν*, Acts xiv. 13, as no other term is added, may be most naturally understood of the city gates, not of the door of the house, in which Paul and Barnabas were staying; in the latter case, the plural would hardly have been used. The *ἰερα* in verse 14 can prove nothing: for it might easily be omitted to state whether they heard of what had happened while in their lodging, and now hastened to the gates, or that they were at that time near the gates. Perhaps Luke himself had no exact information on these points.

Zeus before the gate for the welfare of the city; or intended to bring the animals to Paul's residence, and there to perform the sacrifice, but before he had entered the gates, Paul and Barnabas hastened thither, full of consternation, as soon as they discovered the object of these preparations. They rent their garments—a customary sign among the Jews of abhorrence for whatever outraged the religious feelings—and rushed among the crowd. Paul exclaimed, "What do ye! We are men like yourselves; we are come hither for this very purpose, that you may turn from these who are no gods, to the living God, the Almighty Creator of the universe, who hitherto has allowed the nations of the earth to try by their own experience how far they can attain in the knowledge of religion by the powers of their own reason, but who yet has not left himself without witnesses among them, by granting them all good things from heaven, and supplying them with those gifts of nature which contribute to the preservation of life and to their general well-being."*

Even by such an appeal it was difficult to turn the people from their purpose. Yet this impression on the senses, so powerful for a short time, soon passed away from men who were not affected internally by the power of truth. The Jews from Iconium succeeded in instigating the greater part of the people against Paul. He was stoned in a popular tumult, and dragged out of the city for dead. But while the believers from the city where standing round him and using means for his restoration, he arose strengthened by the power of God; and after spending only the remainder of that day at Lystra, departed with Barnabas to the neighbouring town of Derbe. When they had proclaimed the gospel there and in the neighbourhood,† they again visited those

* The sense of benefits received should have been the means of leading men to the Giver. From a perversion of this sense arose systems of natural religion, to which the immediate revelation of God opposed itself—appealing to that original but misunderstood and misdirected sense.

† The *περιχωρησιν* evidently means only the places lying in

towns in which they had propagated the faith on this journey, and which through persecutions they had been obliged to leave sooner than they wished; they endeavoured to establish the faith of the new converts, and regularly organized the churches. They then returned by their former route to Antioch.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DIVISION BETWEEN THE JEWISH AND GENTILE CHRISTIANS AND ITS SETTLEMENT.—THE INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENTILE CHURCH.

WHILE in this manner Christianity spread itself from Antioch, the parent-church of the Gentile world, and that great revolution began, which has continued ever since to work its way among the nations, a division threatened to break out between the two parent-churches, those two central points from which the kingdom of God began to extend itself. It was a great crisis in the history of the church and of mankind. The hidden contrarieties were destined to come forth in order to be overcome by the power of Christianity and reconciled with one another. The question was, in fact, whether the gospel would succeed not only then, but through all future ages.

There came to Antioch many strictly pharisaical-minded Christians from Jerusalem, who, like the Eleazar we have already mentioned, assured the Gentiles that they could not obtain any share in the kingdom of God and its blessedness without circumcision, and entered into a controversy with Paul and Barnabas on the views they

the immediate vicinity of these two towns, certainly not a whole province, and least of all, from its geographical position, the province of Galatia. Hence the supposition that Paul in this first missionary journey preached the gospel to the Galatians is proved to be untenable.

held on this subject. The church at Antioch resolved to send a deputation to Jerusalem for the settlement of this dispute, and their choice naturally fell on Paul and Barnabas, as the persons who had been most active in the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles. Paul had, besides, a special reason which would have determined him to undertake the journey without any public commission. It appeared now the fittest time for explaining himself to the apostles respecting the manner in which he published the gospel among the heathen, in order to bring into distinct recognition their unity of spirit amidst their diversity of method—(as the latter was necessary through the diversity of their spheres of action)—and to obviate all those contrarieties by which the consciousness of that essential unity could be disturbed. He felt assured by divine illumination, that an explanation on this subject was essential for the well-being of the church. The proposal to send such a deputation to Jerusalem probably originated with himself. He went up to Jerusalem* in the year 50, in order (as he himself tells us in the Epistle to the Galatians), partly for private interview with the most eminent of the apostles; partly to render an account in public before the assembled church of his conduct in publishing the gospel, that no one might suppose that all his labours had been in vain, but might learn that he preached the same gospel as themselves, and that it had been effective with divine power among the Gentiles. He took with him a converted youth of Gentile descent, Titus (who afterwards became his chief associate in preaching), in order to exhibit in his person a living example of the power of the gospel among the heathen.

Before a public consultation was held at Jerusalem, there were many private conferences.† The most im-

* On the supposition that Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, reckons fourteen years from his conversion, and that this took place in the year 36. About six years would have passed since his return from Jerusalem to Antioch.

† We have already remarked, that though Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, particularly mentions his private

portant result was, that after Paul had given a full account to the apostles,* James, Peter, and John, of his method of publishing the gospel to the Gentiles and of the fruit of his labours, they acknowledged the divine origin of his apostleship, instead of presuming to dictate to him as his superiors. They agreed that he should continue to labour independently among the heathen, making only one stipulation, that, as heretofore, the Gentile churches should continue to relieve the temporal wants of the poor Christians at Jerusalem. In the private circles also, in which Paul and Barnabas recounted what God had effected by their preaching among the Gentiles, their accounts were received with joyful interest. But some who had passed over to Christianity from the Pharisaic school, now came forward and declared that it was necessary that the Gentiles should receive circumcision along with the gospel, and that they could acknowledge them as Christian brethren only on this condition, and therefore insisted that Titus should be circumcised. But Paul strenuously maintained against them the equal privileges of the Gentiles in the kingdom of God, and that by faith in the Redeemer they had entered into the same relation towards God as the be-

conferences with the most eminent apostles, yet in doing so, he by no means excludes other public discussions. Indeed, it is self-evident, that Paul, before this subject was discussed in so large an assembly, had agreed with the apostles on the principles that were to be adopted. Nor would he in an assembly composed of such a variety of characters, bring forward every thing which might have passed in more private communications.

* The order in which the three apostles are mentioned is not unimportant. The reading according to which James stands first, is without doubt the true one; the other must have been derived from the custom of giving Peter the primacy among the apostles. But the priority is given to James, because he was most esteemed by the Jewish Christians, who were strict observers of the Mosaic Law, and stood at the head of the church at Jerusalem, while Peter by his intercourse with the Gentiles and Gentile Christians, was in some degree estranged from that party.

lieving Jews : for this reason, he would not give way to them in reference to Titus, for this would have been interpreted by the Pharisaic Jewish Christians as a concession of the principle for which they contended.*

As these objections gave rise to much altercation, it was thought necessary that the subject should be discussed in a convention of the whole church ; but this was afterwards changed into a meeting of chosen delegates. † At this meeting, after much discussion, Peter rose up, to appeal to the testimony of his own experience. They well knew—he said—that God had long before ‡ chosen him, to bring the Gentiles to faith in the gospel ; and since God who seeth the heart, had communicated to them the Holy Spirit, in the same manner as to the believers from among the Jews, he had by this act testified that in his eyes they were no longer impure,

* The reading which omits *ἵς ἑσθι* in Gal. ii. 5, would suppose, on the contrary, a concession of Paul in this case, but which, under the existing circumstances, would be wholly inconsistent with the character of the apostle. This peculiar reading of the old Latin church, evidently proceeded in part from the difficulty of the construction for the Latin translation, and partly from the perception of a supposed contradiction between the conduct of Paul with Titus, and his conduct with Timothy, and likewise from opposition to Marcion. That in the Greek church, which, in consequence of the principle of the *εἰκονισμὸς* predominating in it, must have been much disposed to such a reading, no trace of it can be found, proves how very much the authority of the manuscripts is against it.

† The whole church was far too numerous, to allow of all its members meeting for consultation ; but that they took a part in the deliberations, appears inferrible from the words *οὐκ ἄλλῃ τοῦ ἑλληνισμοῦ*, Acts xv. 22. The epistle to the Gentile Christians was written in the name not merely of the elders of the church, but of all the Christian brethren. Also the words *πάντες τοις ἀγαπῶσι*, Acts xv. 12, favour this interpretation.

‡ Peter's words, *ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*, are of some value for a chronological purpose, since they evidently shew, that between the holding of this assembly and the conversion of Cornelius, to say the least, a tolerable length of time must have elapsed.

after he had purified their hearts by faith in the Redeemer; they were now as pure as the believing Jews, and hence in the communication of spiritual gifts, God had made no difference between them. How then could they venture to question the power and grace of God, as if he could not without the law admit the Gentiles to a participation of salvation in the kingdom of God? Why would they lay a yoke on believers, which neither they nor their fathers had been able to bear? By "a yoke" Peter certainly did not mean the outward observance of ceremonies simply as such, for he himself still observed them, and did not wish to persuade the Jewish Christians to renounce them. But he meant the outward observance of the law, as far as it proceeded from its internal dominion over the conscience, so as to make justification and salvation dependent upon it; whence arose the dread of putting their salvation in jeopardy by the slightest deviation from it; and that tormenting scrupulosity which invented a number of limitations, in order, by such self-imposed restraint, to guard against every possible transgression of the law. As Peter understood the term in this sense, he could add, "But we also by faith in Jesus as our Redeemer have been freed from the yoke of the law, since we are no longer bound to it as a means of justification; for we, as well as the Gentiles, believe that we shall obtain salvation through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ."

These words of Peter made a deep impression on many, and a general silence followed. After a while, Barnabas, who had for years been highly esteemed by this church, rose, and then Paul. In addition to the facts reported by Peter which testified the operation of the Divine Spirit among the Gentiles, they mentioned others from their own experience, and recounted the miracles by which God had aided their labours. When the minds of the assembly were thus prepared, James* came forward, who, on account of his strict observance of the

* The question whether this was the son of Alphæus, or another person, must be left for future examination.

law, was held in the greatest reverence by the Jews, and in whose words, therefore, the greatest confidence would be placed. He brought their deliberations to a close, by a proposal which corresponded to his own peculiar moderation and mildness, and was adapted to compose the existing differences. Referring to Peter's address, he said that this apostle had shewn how God had already received the Gentiles, in order to form a people dedicated to his service. And this agreed with the predictions of the prophets, who had foretold that in the times when the decayed theocracy was to be gloriously revived, the worship of Jehovah would be extended also among the Gentiles. Accordingly, what had recently occurred among the Gentiles need not excite their astonishment. God who effected all this, was now fulfilling his eternal counsel, as he had promised by his prophets. Since, therefore, by this eternal counsel of God, the Gentiles were to be incorporated into his kingdom by the Messiah; let them not dare to do any thing which might obstruct or retard the progress of this work. They ought not to lay any unnecessary burdens on the converted Gentiles. They should enjoin nothing more upon them than abstinence from meat offered to idols* or of animals strangled, from blood and from unchastity.† But as to believers from among the Jews, no such special injunctions were needed for them. They already knew what they were to practise as Jews; for in every city, where

* What remained of the flesh of animals used in sacrifice, was partly used by those who presented the sacrifice at their own meals, (especially if they were festive in honour of the gods,) and partly disposed of in the market. The eating of what were called *בשרי זבחים* was regarded by the Jews with the greatest detestation. *Pirke Avoth*. ch. iii. § 3.

† Most of these points belonged to the seven precepts, to the observance of which men were bound before the giving of the Mosaic law, which God gave to the sons of Noah, and to the observance of which, the Proselytes of the Gate bound themselves. Vid. *Buxtorf lexicon Talmudicum et Rabbinicum* sub voce *שבע*.

Jews resided, the law of Moses was read on the Sabbath-days in the Synagogues, Acts xv. 21.* The concluding words were adapted to pacify the Jews on account of freedom from the Mosaic law allowed to the Gentile Christians.

The resolutions passed on this occasion had for their object, to reduce by mutual approximation the opposition existing between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. The observance of these ordinances by the latter, would tend to lessen and by degrees to destroy, the aversion with which native Jews were wont to regard as impure men who had been brought up as idolaters; it might assist us in forming correct notions of their feelings to compare (though the cases are not exactly parallel) the re-

* It appears to me entirely impossible, so to understand the words in Acts xv. 21 (as they have been understood by the latest expositors, Meyer and Olshausen), as containing a reason for what had been said before. *This* assembly required no reason why they should impose *so much*, but only why they should impose *no more* on the Gentile Christians. Also from the form of the clauses in v. 19 and 20, if such a reference existed, we should expect to find a reason of this kind, namely for the *μη παρικοχλείν*. These words, too, taken in their obvious sense, cannot contain the positive reason for the issuing of these injunctions; for that Moses was read in the synagogue every Sabbath-day, should rather serve as the foundation of a requirement for the observance of the whole law. But in verse 21, the emphasis is on the word *Μωσῆς*, and in that is concealed an antithesis to that which is given as the standing-point for the converts from heathenism. But as to what concerns the Jews, those who *wish* to observe the law, we need to say nothing new to *them*, for they can hear every Sabbath in the Synagogue what *Moses* requires of them. It cannot be our intention, while we prescribe *no more than this* to the converts from heathenism, to diminish the reverence of the Jews for the Mosaic law. Chrysostom adopts very nearly this interpretation, by following the natural connection of the passage. Hom. 33, § 2, *καὶ ἵνα μὴ τις ἀδυσχελεῖ, διὰ τὴν μὴ ἰουδαίοις τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπιστιλλόμεν; ἰσηγάγι λίγων*, and he explains the words v. 21, *τούτ' ἐστὶ Μωσῆς αὐτοῖς διαλεγόμενος*. It gives me pleasure to agree with Dr Schneckenburger in my view of this passage; see his excellent remarks, in his work before quoted, on the Acts, p. 23.

lation of the offspring of a nation where Christianity has long been established to the newly converted Christians from modern heathenism. But if the believing Jews could not bring themselves to overcome their prejudices against the believing Gentiles as uncircumcised, it would be so much more difficult to bring such persons closer to them, if they did not at all observe what was required of the usual Proselytes, and renounce what from the Jewish standing-point appeared closely connected with idolatry, and the impure life of idolaters. And as these ordinances would serve on the one hand to bring Gentile Christians nearer to Jewish Christians; so, on the other hand, they might contribute to withdraw the former more from the usual heathenish mode of living, and guard them against the pollution of heathenish intercourse and indulgences. The experience of the next century teaches us, how even the misunderstanding, which made out of these ordinances a positive law applicable to all ages of the Church,* might in this direction, work for

* In the first ages, Christians were distinguished by not venturing to eat any of the things forbidden in this injunction. But when the early indiscriminating opposition against heathenism had ceased, a more correct view was taken, which Augustine has beautifully developed. "(Apostoli) elegisse mihi videntur pro tempore rem facilem et nequaquam observantibus onerosam, in qua cum Israelitis etiam gentis propter angularem illum lapidem duos in se condentem aliquid communiter observarent. Transacto vero illo tempore, quo illi duo parietes, unus de circumcisione, alter de præputio venientes, quamvis in angulari lapide concordarent, tamen suis quibusdam proprietatibus distinctius eminebant, ac ubi ecclesia gentium talis effecta est, ut in ea nullus Israëlita carnalis appareat, quis jam hoc Christianus observat, ut turdas vel minutiores aviculas non adtingat, nisi quarum sanguis effusus est, aut leporem non edat, si manu a cervice percussus nullo cruento vulnere occisus est? Et qui forte pauci tangere ista formidant a cæteris iridentur, ita omnium animos in hac re tenuit sententia veritatis." *Matt. xv. 11* *Augustin c. Faustum Manich. lib. xxxii. c. 13.* The opposite view, it is true, was maintained in the Greek Church, in which the injunction of abstinence from blood and from animals strangled was confirmed by the Second Trullanian Council, in the year 692.

good. Viewing the transaction in this light, it is indeed surprising that to ordinances merely disciplinary, and intended for only one particular period, and for persons under certain peculiar relations, the command against unchastity binding in all ages, and relating to an objectively moral point, should be annexed. But the connection in which this prohibition appears, furnishes the best explanation of the cause and design of its introduction. *Παγνια* is mentioned in connection with the other points, on account of the close connection in which it appeared to the Jews to stand with idolatry; for in the writings of the Old Testament they were accustomed to see idolatry and unchastity every where placed together; excesses of this class were really connected with many parts of idolatry; and the strict idea of chastity in a comprehensive sense formed the standing-point of natural religion. It is introduced here not as a special moral precept of Christianity; in that case, it would not have been so insulated as a positive command, but would rather have been deduced from its connection with the whole of the Christian faith and life as we find it in the Apostolic Epistles. Here it is introduced as a part of the ancient Jewish opposition to every thing which appeared connected with idolatry, and this opposition was now to be transferred to the new Christian Church.

Although these injunctions had a precise object, and doubtless attained it in some measure, yet we cannot conclude with certainty, that James had a clear perception of it in all its extent, when he proposed this middle-way. As the persons who composed this assembly acted not merely according to the suggestions of human prudence, but chiefly as the organs of a higher spirit that animated them, of a higher wisdom that guided them, it would follow, that their injunctions served for certain ends in the guidance of the church, which were not perfectly clear to their own apprehension. Even James himself does not develope the motives which determined him to propose such a measure. In this assembly there was no occasion, as we have before remarked, to mention the principles, but merely to develope the reason,

why no more than this, and not the whole law, should be imposed on Christians; and this reason accordingly, he deduced from what he and the other apostles recognised as the central point of the Christian faith. Possibly James, without any distinct views and aims, only believed that something must be done for the Gentile Christians, (who were to be acknowledged as members of God's kingdom, with equal privileges, in virtue of their faith in Jehovah and the Messiah,) to bring them nearer, as it regarded their outward mode of life, like the Proselytes of the Gate,* to Judaism and the Jews.†

But although it was not necessary in this public assembly, to develope in a positive manner the motives for framing these injunctions, we are certainly not to assume, that the apostles left the decision of the principles, on which they meant to act towards Gentile Christians, to the deliberations of this meeting; but as we

* I mean only analogous regulations; for had there been simply a transference of such as were enjoined to the Proselytes of the Gate, it would have been sufficient to require of the Gentile Christians, among whom many Proselytes of the Gate might be found, that they should submit to all the regulations which had hitherto been observed by persons of that class.

† Luther, who was far from the restricted, unnatural notion of inspiration, and the slavish adherence to the letter, maintained by the theologians of the 17th century, says, in reference to this proposal of James (vol. viii. p. 1042 of Walch's edition), "that the Holy Spirit allowed St James to make a false step." But even if James had not before him the higher object for the guidance of the church, this ought not to be called a false step, in relation to the peculiar standing-point which he took in the historical development of primitive Christianity; for he was appointed by the Lord of the church to occupy the intermediate standing-point which was to connect the Old Testament with the independent development of the New, and from which he presented the new spirit of the gospel in the form of the Old Testament. It becomes us, when we are considering the joint labours of the apostles, to observe attentively the whole scheme of organic historical development, in which each member takes his appropriate station, and all are designed to be complements to one another.

have before remarked, most probably brought forward only what seemed to them in their private conference best adapted for their object; in that consultation it was necessary to discuss the motives for these injunctions, and the objects which it was proposed to attain by them; for in relation to what Paul desired—that to those among the Gentiles, who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, nothing further should be prescribed—a conciliatory measure of this kind must have been accompanied by a statement of the principles on which it was founded. And as we must acknowledge in James the power of the Christian spirit, that he subordinated to the interests of Christianity his attachment to Judaism and the forms of the ancient theocracy; so in Paul, who was so zealous for the independence of Christianity and of the Gentile churches, we must recognise a zeal tempered by Christian wisdom, which yielded to a measure of accommodation determined by circumstances.*

The resolutions adopted on this occasion were now communicated to the Gentile churches in Syria and Cilicia,† in an epistle drawn up in the name of the assembly; and two persons of good repute in the church, perhaps members of the Presbytery at Jerusalem, Barsabas and Silas (Silvanus), were chosen as bearers of it, who were to accompany Paul and Barnabas, and counterwork the intrigues of their Judaizing opponents. We will here insert this short epistle, probably dictated by James

* Luther beautifully remarks, in the passage above quoted, "Therefore they agree that James should prescribe, and since their consciences are left free and unfettered, that they think is enough for them; they were not so envious as to wish to quarrel about a little thing, provided it could be done without damage."

† The injunctions were designed, it is true, for all Gentile Christians, but the epistle was addressed only to the churches specified in it, because in these the dispute had first of all arisen, and because they must have been respected, as parent churches among the Gentiles, with which the later formed Asiatic churches would connect themselves. Hence also Paul, in Gal. i. 21, as a general description of the sphere of his labours, mentions only the *ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας*.

himself, and the earliest public document of the Christian church known to us.* It is as follows: "The Apostles and Elders, and Brethren,† send greeting to the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia.‡ Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words, saying ye must be circumcised, and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment: It seemed good unto us being assembled together,|| to send

* The style of this document (marked by simplicity and extreme brevity), testifies its originality. Had the author of the Acts set himself to compose such an epistle, and attempted to assume the situation of the writer, it would have been a very different composition. And hence we may draw a conclusion relative to the discourses given in the Acts.

† According to the reading adopted by Lachmann, it would be, "The Apostles and Presbyters, Christian brethren," they wrote as brethren to brethren. This reading is strongly reported. We can hardly deduce its origin from hierarchical influences, which would have excluded the church from such consultations and decisions; its antiquity is too great, for we find it in Irenæus iii. 12, 14. It is also equally against the hierarchical spirit for the apostles and presbyters to write to the brethren as brethren. And it may be easily explained, how it happened that since, from the introductory words of Luke, they expected an epistle from the whole church, it seemed necessary to distinguish the brethren from the apostles and presbyters, and hence probably the words *καὶ ἐγὼ* were inserted. Yet since, in Acts xv. 22, the whole church is mentioned in connection with the apostles and presbyters, we might expect in the epistle itself a distinct reference to the church; the *καὶ ἡμεῖς* also of verse 24 (for these anonymous complainers could hardly belong to the presbyters of the church) appears to assume this. The first *καὶ ἐγὼ*, verse 24, must have occasioned the omission of the second.

‡ The *χαίρειν* here wants the *ἐν κυρίῳ*, which is so common in the Pauline Epistles; but it deserves notice that, as a salutation only, this *χαίρειν* is found in the Epistle of James.

|| The words *ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐμαρτυροῦμεν*, I do not understand with Meyer, "being unanimous," but, "when we were met together;" as *ἐμαρτυροῦμεν* often denotes in the Acts, not, "of one mind," but, "together," as in v. 46. We may see from the Alexandrian version, and Josephus (Antiq. xix. 9, § 1), how the change of meaning has been formed.

chosen men unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul,—men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have therefore sent Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth.* For it seemed good to us, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit,† to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things—that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from unchastity; from which, if ye keep yourselves,‡ ye shall do well. Fare ye well.”

* The explanation of this passage, Acts xv. 27, is in every way difficult. If we refer *τα αὐτα* to what goes before, the sense will be,—they will announce to you the same things that Barnabas and Paul have announced to you. So I understood the words in the first edition of this work. The words *δια λόγου* are not exactly against this interpretation: for though these words contained the reference to what followed in writing, they might be thus connected with them; namely, as we now in writing also express the same principles. But since mention is not made before of the preaching of Barnabas and Paul, and we must therefore supply something not before indicated, and since the words *δια λόγου* contain a reference to what follows, and therefore not *παταγγιλλειν*, but *απαγγιλλειν* is here used, I now prefer the other interpretation, although in this case likewise, it is difficult to supply what is necessary. In Irenæus we find a reading which presents the sense required by the connection in a way that removes all difficulties, but must be considered as an exposition; *την γνωμην ἡμῶν*, instead of *τα αὐτα*, annuntiantes nostram sententiam, Iren. iii. 12, 14.

† In the explanation also of Acts xv. 28, I depart, and with greater confidence, from my former view. Agreeably to the manner in which *δοκίμ* is every where placed with the dative of the person as the subject, I cannot help so understanding it with the words *τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*, especially since, if it meant by the Holy Spirit, according to the New Testament idiom, we should expect *ἐν* to be prefixed. It is therefore stated first, it has so pleased the Holy Spirit—then, we as his organs have resolved. Although the affair was determined according to both, it was important to mention first, that this resolution was not formed according to human caprice, but that the Holy Spirit so willed it. I translate in the text, not verbally, but according to the sense.

‡ The expression in Acts xv. 29, *ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς*,

We may conclude from this epistle, that those who had raised the controversy in the Antiochian church, had appealed to the authority of the apostles and presbytery. Perhaps they represented themselves as delegates of the church at Jerusalem,—as this was afterwards made of importance by the adversaries of Paul—but they were not acknowledged as such. We see how important it was for the apostles to accredit Paul and Barnabas as faithful preachers of the gospel, and to give a public testimony to their agreement in spirit with them. Yet we cannot help remarking the brevity of the epistle—the want of a pouring forth of the heart towards the new Christians of an entirely different race—the absence of the development of the views on which the resolutions passed were founded. The epistle was without doubt dictated in haste, and must be taken only for an official document, as the credentials of an oral communication. But they depended more on the living word, than on written characters. Hence, while the written communication was so brief, they sent living organs to Antioch, who would explain every thing more fully according to the sense of this meeting.

Thus Paul and Barnabas, having happily attained their object at Jerusalem, returned to the Gentile Christians at Antioch with these pledges of Christian fellowship, and accompanied by the two delegates. Barnabas took also his nephew Mark with him from Jerusalem, to be an assistant in the common work. He had formerly accompanied them on their first missionary travels in Asia, but had not remained faithful to his vocation; giving way to his feelings of attachment for his native country, he had left them when they entered Pamphylia. At Jerusalem, Barnabas met with him again, and perhaps by his remonstrances, brought him to a sense of his former misconduct, so that he once more joined them.

This decision of the Apostolic Assembly at Jerusalem, forms an important era in the history of the apostolic

is remarkably similar to that in James i. 27, *ἀστυλὸν ἑαυτοῦ
πνεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος.*

church. The first controversy which appeared in the history of Christianity, was thus publicly expressed and presented without disguise; but it was at the same time manifested, that, by this controversy, the unity of the church was not to be destroyed. Although so great and striking a difference of an outward kind existed in the development of the church among the Jews and of that among the Gentiles, still the essential unity of the church, as grounded on real communion of internal faith and life, continued undisturbed thereby, and thus it was manifest that the unity was independent of such outward differences: it became henceforth a settled point, that though one party observed and the other party neglected certain outward usages, yet both, in virtue of their common faith in Jesus as the Redeemer, had received the Holy Spirit as the certain mark of their participating in the kingdom of God. The controversy was not confined to these outward differences; but, as we might conclude from the peculiar nature of the modes of thinking among the Jews, which mingled itself with their conceptions of Christianity, it involved several doctrinal differences. The latter, however, were not brought under discussion; those points only were touched which were most palpable, and appeared the most important from the Jewish standing-point of legal observances. While they firmly held one ground of faith,—faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and a consciousness of fellowship in the one spirit proceeding from him,—they either lost sight altogether of these differences, or viewed them as very subordinate, in relation to the points of agreement, the foundation of the all-comprehending kingdom of God. At a later period, these differences broke out with greater violence, when they were not overpowered by the energy of a Christian spirit progressively developed, and insinuating itself more deeply into the prevalent modes of thinking. Even by this wise settlement of the question, so serious a breach could not be repaired, where the operation of that Spirit was wanting from whom this settlement proceeded. As those who were addicted to Pharisaism were, from the first, accustomed to esteem a Christianity amalgamated

with complete Judaism, as alone genuine and perfect, and rendering men capable of enjoying all the privileges of the kingdom of God, it was hardly possible that these decisions could produce an entire revolution in their mode of thinking; whether it was that they looked upon the decisions of the assembly at Jerusalem as not permanent, or that they explained them according to their own views and interests, as if indeed, though they had not commanded the observance of the law to Gentile Christians, they were designed to intimate that it would be to their advantage, if voluntarily, and out of love to Jehovah, they observed the whole law. And as they had not hesitated, before that assembly was called at Jerusalem, to appeal to the authority of the apostles, although they were by no means authorized to do so, they again attempted to make use of this expedient, of which they could more readily avail themselves on account of the great distance of most of the Gentile churches from Jerusalem.*

Thus we have here the first example of an accommodation of differences which arose in the development of the church, an attempt to effect a union of two contending parties; and we here see what has been often repeated, that union can only be attained where it pro-

* The Acts of the Apostles might lead us to suppose, if we could not compare its statements with the Pauline Epistles, that the division between the Jewish and Gentile Christians had been completely healed by the decision of the apostolic assembly; but we know that the reaction of the Judaizing party against the freedom of the Gentile Christian church, very soon broke out afresh, and that Paul had constantly to combat with it. In this silence of the Acts, I cannot find the slightest trace of an apologetical tendency for Paul, against the Judaizers; in that case, I should rather have expected the Author would have mentioned these subsequent disturbances, and have opposed to them these decisions. Nor can I think an intentional silence probable in relation to the events of a period so deeply agitated by religious concerns. The Acts generally says nothing of the inward development of the Christian church; hence it is silent on so many other things which we would gladly know.

ceeds from an internal unity of Christian consciousness; but where the reconciliation is only external, the deeply-seated differences, though for a brief period repressed, will soon break out afresh. But what is of the greatest importance, we here behold the seal of true catholicism publicly exhibited by the apostles, and the genuine apostolic church. The existence of the genuine catholic church, which so deeply-seated a division threatened to destroy, was thereby secured.

We are now arrived at a point of time in which the Gentile church assumed a peculiar and independent form; but before we trace its farther spread and development in connection with the labours of Paul, let us first glance at the constitution of the church in this new form of Christian fellowship.

CHAPTER V.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH, AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL USAGES OF THE GENTILE CHRISTIANS.

THE forms under which the constitution of the Christian community at first developed itself, were, as we have before remarked, most nearly resembling those which already existed in the Jewish church. But these forms, after their adoption by Jewish Christians, would not have been transferred to the Gentile churches, if they had not so closely corresponded to the nature of the Christian community as to furnish it with a model for its organization. This peculiar nature of the Christian community distinguished the Christian church from all other religious associations, and after Christianity had burst the fetters of Judaism, shewed itself among the free and self-subsistent churches of the Gentile Christians. Since Christ satisfied once for all that religious want, from the sense of which a priesthood has every where originated,—since he satisfied the sense of the

need of mediation and reconciliation, so deeply seated in the consciousness of the separation from God by sin, there was no longer room or necessity for any other mediation. If, in the apostolic epistles, the Old Testament ideas of a priesthood, a priestly cultus and sacrifices are applied to the new economy, it is only with the design of shewing, that, since Christ has for ever accomplished that which the priesthood and sacrifices in the Old Testament prefigured,—all who now appropriate by faith what he effected for mankind, stand in the same relation with one another to God, without needing any other mediation,—that they are all by communion with Christ dedicated and consecrated to God, and are called to present their whole lives to God as an acceptable, spiritual thank-offering, and thus their whole consecrated activity is a true spiritual, priestly cultus, Christians forming a divine kingdom of priests. Rom. xii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 9. This idea of the general priesthood of all Christians, proceeding from the consciousness of redemption, and grounded alone in that, is partly stated and developed in express terms, and partly presupposed in the epithets, images, and comparisons, applied to the Christian life.

As all believers were conscious of an equal relation to Christ as their Redeemer, and of a common participation of communion with God obtained through him; so on this consciousness, an equal relation of believers to one another was grounded, which utterly precluded any relation like that found in other forms of religion, subsisting between a priestly caste and a people of whom they were the mediators and spiritual guides. The apostles themselves were very far from placing themselves in a relation to believers which bore any resemblance to a mediating priesthood; in this respect they always placed themselves on a footing of equality. If Paul assured the church of his intercessory prayers for them, he in return requested their prayers for himself. There were accordingly no such persons in the Christian church, who, like the priests of antiquity, claimed the possession of an esoteric doctrine, while they kept the people in a state of spiritual pupillage and dependence

on themselves, as their sole guides and instructors in religious matters. Such a relation would have been inconsistent with the consciousness of an equal dependence on Christ, and an equal relation to him as participating in the same spiritual life. The first Pentecost had given evidence, that a consciousness of the higher life proceeding from communion with Christ filled all believers, and similar effects were produced at every season of Christian awakening which preceded the formation of a church. The apostle Paul, in the 4th chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians, points out as a common feature of Judaism and Heathenism in this respect, the condition of pupillage, of bondage to outward ordinances. He represents this bondage and pupillage as taken away by the consciousness of redemption, and that the same spirit ought to be in all Christians. He contrasts the heathen who blindly followed their priests, and gave themselves up to all their arts of deception, with true Christians, who, by faith in the Redeemer, became the organs of the Divine Spirit, and could hear the voice of the living God within them; 1 Cor. xii. 1. He thought that he should assume too much to himself, if, in relation to a church already grounded in spiritual things, he represented himself only as giving; for in this respect there was only one general giver, the Saviour himself, as the source of all life in the church, while all others, as members of the spiritual body animated by him the Head, stood to each other in the mutual relation of givers and receivers. Hence it was, that, after he had written to the Romans that he longed to come to them in order to impart some spiritual gift for their establishment, he added, lest he should seem to arrogate too much to himself, "that is, that I may be comforted, together with you, by the *mutual* faith both of you and me;" Rom. i. 12.

Christianity, on the one hand, by the Holy Spirit as the common higher principle of life, gave to the church a unity, more sublime than any other principle of union among men, destined to subordinate to itself, and in this subordination to level, all the varieties founded in the development of human nature. But, on the other hand,

mental peculiarities were not annihilated by this divine life ; since, in all cases, it followed the laws of the natural development of man, but only purified, sanctified, and transformed them, and promoted their freer and more complete expansion. The higher unity of life exhibited itself in a multiplicity of individualities, animated by the same spirit, and forming reciprocal complements to each other as parts of one vast whole in the kingdom of God. Consequently, the manner in which this divine life manifested its efficiency in each, was determined by the previous mental individuality of each. The apostle Paul says, indeed, " But all these worketh that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will, 1 Cor. xii. 11 ; but it by no means follows, that he supposes an operation of the Divine Spirit totally unconditional. In this passage, he is simply opposing an arbitrary human valuation, which would attribute a worth to only certain gifts of grace, and refused to acknowledge the manifoldness in their distribution. The analogy to the members of the human body, of which the apostle avails himself, betokens the not arbitrary but regulated development of the new creation in a sanctified natural order ; for it is evident from this analogy, that as, among the members of the human body, each has its determinate place assigned by nature, and its appropriate function, so also the divine life, in its development, follows a similar law, grounded on the natural relations of the individualities animated by it. From what has just been said, we are prepared for rightly understanding the idea of *charisma*, so very important for the history of the development of the Christian life, and of the constitution of the Christian church in the first ages. In the apostolic age, it denoted nothing else than the predominant capability of an individual in which the power and operation of the Holy Spirit that animated him was revealed ; * whether this capability appeared as something communicated in an immediate manner by the Holy Spirit, or whether it was already existing in the individual before

† The *φανερωσις τοῦ πνεύματος* peculiar to each person.

his conversion, which, animated, sanctified, and raised by the new principle of life, would contribute to one common and supreme object, the inward and outward development of the kingdom of God, or the church of Christ.* That which is the soul of the whole Christian's life, and forms its inward unity, the faith working by love, can never appear as a particular charism; for as this it is which forms the essence of the whole Christian disposition, so it is this which must govern all the particular Christian capabilities; and it is because they are all regulated by this common principle of the Christian disposition, that the particular capabilities become charisms; 1 Cor. xiii.

That by which the developed natural endowment becomes a charism, and which is common to all, is always something elevated above the common course of nature, something divine. But the forms of manifestation in which this higher principle exhibited itself, were marked by a diversity, according as it was the result of an original creative operation of the Holy Spirit, making use of the course of nature, and evincing its presence by some immediate effect, (though even here a hidden connection might exist between the natural peculiarities of the individual and such a special acting of the Holy Spirit); these are charisms which, in the New Testament, are called *δυνάμεις, σημεῖα, τέχνη*; or the manifestations might be deduced from the development of natural talents un-

* The word most generally used, whereby (since Paul has used it in this sense) is signified, all that concerns the internal advancement of the kingdom of God—whether in reference to the church in general, or to individuals—is *ἐκδοσις*. This use of the word arises from the practice of comparing the Christian life of the whole church, and its individual members, to a building, a temple of God which is built on the foundation on which this building necessarily rests, 1 Cor. iii. 9 and 10, and is in a state of continual progress towards completion. On this progressive building of the temple of God, both in general and individually, see the admirable remarks in Nitzsch's *Observationes ad theologiam practicam feliciter excolendam*. Bonn, 1831, p. 24.

der the animating influence of the Holy Spirit. The first kind of charisms belong more to the peculiar operation of the Holy Spirit in the apostolic age, that peculiarly creative epoch of Christianity on its first appearance in the world; the second kind belonged to the operation of the Holy Spirit through all succeeding ages of the church, by which human nature, in its essential qualities and its whole course of development, will be progressively penetrated and transformed. These two forms of charism admit therefore of being clearly distinguished, as they were manifested in the apostolic church. The gifts by which such effects were produced in the visible world, which could not proceed from the existing powers and laws of nature, the gift of *δυναμεις*, and one still more definite, that of curing diseases, the *χαρισματα ιασηντων*, are mentioned as special gifts; 1 Cor. xii. 9, 10. Yet these gifts are only ranked with others; we find no division of gifts into two classes, extraordinary and ordinary, supernatural and natural; for we contemplate the apostolic church from the right point of view, only when we consider the essential in all these gifts to be the supernatural principle, the divine element of life itself.

The charisms which appeared in the apostolic church, may be most naturally divided into such as relate to the furtherance of the kingdom of God or the edification of the church by the word, and such as relate to the furtherance of the kingdom of God by other kinds of outward* agency. As to the first class, a distinction may be made, founded on the relation in which the mental self-activity developed in the various powers of the soul and their performances bears to the inworking of the Holy Spirit: in proportion as the immediate force of inspiration predominated in the higher self-consciousness (the *νοῦς*; or *πνεῦμα*), and the lower self-consciousness (the *ψυχή*) the medium of the soul's intercourse with the outward world, retired; or as the communications of the Divine Spirit were received during the harmonious co-opera-

* Compare 1 Peter iv. 11.

ration of *all* the powers of the soul, and developed and applied by the sober exercise of the understanding.* Hence the gradations in the charisms of which we have already spoken, the charism of *γλωσσαις λαλεῖν*, of *προφητεῖν*, and of *διδασκαλία*. Men who were prepared by the early cultivation of the intellect, and the aptitude for mental communication by means of it, hence knew how to develope and communicate in logical consecutiveness what the illumination of the Divine Spirit revealed to their higher self-consciousness. The *διδασκαλοι* are therefore teachers possessed of Christian knowledge (*γινωσις*), who had gained it by means of a self-activity animated by the Holy Spirit, through the development and elaboration of truth known in the divine light. The prophet, on the contrary, spoke, as he was carried away by the power of inspiration suddenly seizing him, an instantaneous elevation of his higher self-consciousness, according to a light that then gleamed upon him, (an *ἀποκαλύψις*). The prophet might be distinguished from the *διδασκαλος* in reference to his mental peculiarity and formation, by the predominance, in general, of the feelings and intuitive perceptions over the activity of the understanding. Yet the two charisms were not always found separate in different persons. The *διδασκαλος* in many a moment of inspiration might become a *προφητης*. The prophet might pronounce, under the influence of inspiration, some impressive address, to awaken, to admonish, to warn, or to console the assembled believers; or make appeals to those who were not yet decided in the faith, by which he alarmed their consciences and thus opened their hearts for the instructions of the *διδασκαλος*. It is evident what influence the power of inspired discourse operating on the heart must have had for the spread of the gospel during this period. Persons who wished for once to inform themselves respecting what occurred in Christian assemblies, or to become acquainted with the Christian

* We can here make use of what Synesius in his *Dion* says of the relation of the *βουχία*, of the *ἄλμα μανικόν*, of the *διοφρητόν*, to the formation of the *μίσθ καὶ πιστοτατὴν δύναμις*.

doctrine, of whose divine origin they were not yet convinced, sometimes came into the assemblies of the Church.*

* The ἀπιστος, 1 Cor. xiv. 24, means a person not yet a believer, but yet not unsusceptible of faith, the *Infidelis negative*. Such a one might be awakened to believe by the πρροφηται. The ἀπιστος, 1 Cor. 22, is an obstinate unbeliever, wholly unsusceptible of faith, and hence utterly unsusceptible of the influence of the πρροφηται, an *infidelis privative*. For such persons there could be no awakening, but only condemnatory σημεια. I am not induced by what Meier has said, in his Commentary on the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, to give up this interpretation. The connection makes it absolutely necessary, to give a different meaning to ἀπιστος in 1 Cor. xiv. 23 and 24, from what it bears in v. 22, and the collocation of διδωται and ἀπιστοι confirms this explanation. The διδωται were those who knew only a little of Christianity, the ἀπιστοι those who had not yet attained to faith, and as not believing, were akin to the class mentioned in v. 22, but distinguished from them by the direction of their disposition, and its relation to believing, inasmuch as they were not in the position of decided enmity to Christianity. The fact of their attending Christian assemblies, bore evidence of their seeking after truth, that there was at least the germ of susceptibility. A person of this class came to the Christian assemblies, in order to learn, whether it was really a matter worth attending to, "*accensus inquirere quid sit in causa*," as Tertullian says. The train of thought is as follows: V. 21, God speaks by people using a strange language (the revelation of his judgment) to the Jews, who would not listen to the prophets speaking to them in their own language; v. 22, Thus the unintelligible tongues are for signs (signs of merited divine judgments, condemnatory signs) not for believers, (which idea is amplified in verses 23, 24, in order to be applied to those who are susceptible of faith, whose minds are somewhat moved to believe;) but for unbelievers (by which is here indicated what is absolutely contrary to believing—the standing-point of those who have obstinately rejected the opportunities of attaining faith). But prophecy is not for the unbelieving (in consequence of the contrariety of their disposition), but for believers. This general position, that not the gift of unintelligible tongues, but prophecy speaking intelligibly to them, was designed for such, the apostle lays down in v. 23, as an inference from what he had said before. But instead of taking an example from those who already belonged to the church as decided believers, he takes the example of

On these occasions, Christian men came forward who testified of the corruption of human nature, and of the universal need of redemption, with overpowering energy; and, from their own religious and moral consciousness, appealed to that of others, as if they could read it. The heathen felt his conscience struck, his heart was laid open, and he was forced to acknowledge, what hitherto he had not been willing to believe, that the power of God was with this doctrine and dwelt among these men; 1 Cor. xiv. 25. If the connected addresses of the *διδασκαλος* tended to lead those further into a knowledge of the gospel who had already attained to faith, or to develop in their minds the clearer understanding of what they had received by faith; the *προφητια* served rather to awaken those to faith who were not yet believers, or to animate and strengthen those who had attained to faith, to quicken afresh the life of faith. On the contrary, in the *γλασσαις λαλιῶν*, the elevated consciousness of God predominated, while the consciousness of the external world vanished. To a person who expressed himself in this manner, the medium of communication between the external world and his deeply moved interior, was altogether wanting. What he uttered in this state when carried away by his feelings and intuitions, was not a connected address like that of a *διδασκαλος*, nor was it an exhortation suited to

such who were in their progress towards believing; since in these the truth of what they had asserted was more strikingly evident, and shew how many such persons might be won by prophecy, while on the contrary, the sight of an assembly in which they heard nothing but ecstatic unintelligible discourses must operate injuriously upon them; in the latter case, they would feel themselves compelled to suppose that there was nothing in Christianity but delusion and enthusiasm. But if the same unbelievers were intended in verse 23 as in verse 22, then for such even the discourses of the prophets would be nothing that could profit them, since there was no point of connection in their dispositions. To them even what they heard spoken by the prophets, would appear nothing but enthusiasm. It would be a punishment merited by them, to be addressed in unintelligible language, since they *would* not understand—they *should* not understand.

the circumstances of other persons (*παρεκκλησις*), like that of the prophets; but without being capable in this situation of taking notice of the mental state and necessities of others, he was occupied solely with the relation of his own heart to God. His soul was absorbed in devotion and adoration. Hence prayer, singing the praises of God, testifying of the mighty acts of God, were suited to this state.* Such a person prayed in the Spirit; the higher life of the mind and disposition predominated, but the intelligent development was wanting.† Since he

* As various kinds of religious acts might proceed from this state of mind, (as for instance *προσηυχισθαι* and *ψαλλειν*), the plural *γλασσαι* and the phrase *γρη γλασσαι* are used.

† At all events it is certain that in 1 Cor. xiv. 14, *πνευματι προσηυχισθαι, ψαλλειν*, is equally with *γλασσαι λαλειν*, opposed to *ταυτοι ορα του νοου λαλειν*, and it is certain that the latter means—to deliver something through the medium of thinking, in a form proceeding from a sound consciousness. But it may be disputed—which yet decides nothing respecting the subject as a whole—whether *πνευμα* in this whole section is a designation of the ecstatic state, as one in which the excitation produced by the Divine Spirit, the immediate action of inspiration predominates, and the human self-activity is repressed; or whether by this name denotes a peculiar internal power of human nature, the power of higher intuition, which in such states alone is developed and active. Verses 15 and 16, would favour and justify no other interpretation than the former. But according to verse 14, though this interpretation is not impossible, there are some difficulties; for here by the *πνευμα* must be denoted the inspiration effected by the Spirit, as something dwelling in the soul, and blended with the subjective. Instead of saying, I pray in inspiration, Paul would say, My spirit (*that* in me which is one with the Spirit acting within me) prays. It cannot be denied that this interpretation has something harsh, which is not found in the second, if by *πνευμα* we understand that highest power of the soul, which in those highest moments of the inner life, is active as the organ for the influences of the Divine Spirit. It cannot at least be decisive against this interpretation, that Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, generally designates the higher spiritual nature of man, by the term *νοος*; for this need not prevent his applying the same name to a more limited idea in another connection; the *νοος* = *τα νοητα*, the discursive faculty of thought, in distinction from the higher

formed peculiar language for himself, from his own individual feelings and intuitions, he was deficient in the ability to express himself so as to be understood by the majority. Had the apostle Paul held the *γλωσσους λαλῶν* to be something quite enthusiastic and morbid, neither advantageous for the Christian life of the individual nor for the furtherance of the Christian life in others, he certainly (so liberally as he always acknowledged what was good in the churches to whom he wrote before he blamed what was evil) would never have allowed himself to designate by the name of a charism, an imperfection in the Christian life, and never could he, in this case, have said of himself that he thanked God that he spake in more tongues than all of them. On the contrary, from the view here developed of this charism, it is evident that, in this extraordinary elevation of mind, he recognised an operation of the Divine Spirit, a special gift of grace; and there is also an internal probability that *that* apostle, who rose to the highest point of the interior Christian life, who could depose to having received so many *ἐπιστasiai* and *ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου*, who had heard things unutterable in any tongue of men—had often been in circumstances corresponding to the *γλωσσους λαλῶν*. But it was consonant with that wisdom which always took account of the interests of all classes in the Church,

faculty of intuition, which is more receptive, by surrendering itself to the Divine Spirit. It is worthy of remark, and assists in forming a right judgment of the various charisms in relation to Christianity, that in the sense assigned to the *γλωσσους λαλῶν*, we may find something analogous in the *μανια*, the *ἰδιουσιανισμος* of the heathen *μαντις*; on the contrary, in the *διδασκαλία* is presented a characteristic of Christianity, the religion of sober-mindedness; as Christianity is the religion of freedom of mental self-activity, (in opposition to mere passivity), and of harmonious mental development. Hence also the danger that—when a one-sided over-valuation of the *γλωσσους λαλῶν* gained ground, and there was a defect in Christian watchfulness and sobriety, as in heathenism, the excitement of mere natural feeling might injuriously mingle itself with the movements of the divine life—as was the case in Montanism, in which we may observe appearances akin to somnambulism.

that he—although he recognised the value of these temporary elevations for the whole of the Christian life, by which it was enabled to take a wider range—left the manifestations of such moments to the private devotions of each individual, and banished them from meetings for general edification; that he valued more highly those spiritual gifts, which gave scope for the harmonious co-operation of all the powers of the soul, and contributed in the spirit of love to the general edification; and that he dreaded the danger of self-deception and enthusiasm, where the extraordinary manifestations of the Christian life were overvalued, and where that—which only was of worth when it arose unsought from the interior development of life,—became an object of anxious pursuit to many who were thus brought into a state of morbid excitement. Hence he wished, that in those highest moments of inspiration which attended the *γλωσσais λαλειν*, every one would pour out his heart alone before God; but that in the assemblies of the Church these manifestations of devotion, unintelligible to the majority, might be repressed; or only be exhibited, when what was thus spoken could be translated into a language intelligible to all.

In these charisms we may also distinguish the gift of a productiveness of religious intuition excited and animated by the Divine Spirit; and the gift which enabled a person to explain or to pass judgment upon what others communicated by means of their charism in the state of higher inspiration, the faculty of interpreting or of judging, animated by the Divine Spirit, the *ερμηνεια γλωσσais* and the *διακρισις πνευματων*. The Christian life was permitted freely to develope and express itself in the church. Whoever felt an inward impulse, might venture to speak in the Christian assemblies; but sound discretion ought to accompany inspiration, and might be considered as a mark of its being genuine. No one was to wish to be the sole speaker; or to interrupt others in speaking; 1 Cor. xiv. 30–31. If Paul considered such injunctions to be necessary, it is apparent that he by no means recognised in the prophets of the church, pure

organs of the Divine Spirit, in whom the divine and the human might not easily be confounded. On the contrary, the churches were to be guarded against the excesses of such a mixture and the delusions which prevailed, when human impurity was looked upon as a suggestion of the Divine Spirit,—by exercising a trial of spirits, for which a special gift was granted to individuals. As for the *διδασκαλος*, in whom the reflective activity of the understanding predominated, the gift of trying spirits was not required so much to accompany his addresses; for since in him the critical power was developed and active, and he was habituated to discuss Christian truths with a sober judgment, he was able to judge himself. But the less a prophet in the moments of inspiration was able to observe, to examine, and to judge himself, the greater was the danger of confounding the divine and the human, and so much the more necessary was it, in order to prevent this, for others to apply a scrutiny. On this account, it was ordered that the operations of the prophetic gift were attended by an extraordinary endowment in certain persons of trying the spirits, a critical power animated by the Holy Spirit. The design of this gift was certainly not merely to decide who was a prophet and who was not; but chiefly for the purpose of distinguishing in the addresses of those who stood up as inspired speakers in the Christian assemblies, between what proceeded from the Divine Spirit, and what did not proceed from that source; so Paul, on this point, recommended the church to try every thing communicated by the prophets, and required them to separate the good from the bad; 1 Thess. v. 21. And as the prophets did not pretend to be infallible, but were conscious of their liability to error, they submitted themselves to the judgment of the church, or of their organs appointed for the purpose, and thus were preserved from the self-delusion of pride, that fruitful source of enthusiasm.

In the charism of *διδασκαλίας*, there appears again to have been a difference, according as any one had an abi-

lity for developing the truth in its theoretic elements, or in its application to the various relations of life; the one was *λογος γνωσις*, the other *λογος σοφίας*.*

But though the terms *γνωσις* and *σοφία* are thus distinguished; it by no means follows, that, in every passage where *σοφία* is mentioned in reference to Christianity, it is used in the same restricted sense, and always with a reference to this distinction. We find both used as synonymous, certainly without any implied reference to such a distinction of practical and theoretical; Coloss. ii. 3. Thus Paul in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, under the name of a *λογος σοφίας*, describes the more ample development of Christian truth, in relation to the first elements of Christian knowledge, the common foundation of Christian consciousness in all believers, and in contrast with the philosophy of the Grecian schools. He knew nothing higher than the doctrine of Jesus Christ the Crucified as the foundation of salvation, and whatever pretended to be superior to this, appeared to him a mere deception. He says, that in the publication of the divine counsels respecting the salvation brought by Christ to mankind, all the treasures of wisdom and

* *Σοφία* principally denoted a practical power of the judgment, corresponding to the idea of wisdom or prudence; while *γνωσις*, in the New Testament and contemporary writings, was used for the theoretical, the more profound knowledge of religion; compare 1 Cor. xiii. 2. When Meier says that the distinction between theoretical and practical does not correspond to the nature of inspired discourse, it appears to me that this objection is not valid: for inspiration in that universal sense, which is here treated of, the animating by the Divine Spirit, from whom all charisms proceed, could not be wanting to any kind of discourse in the church. But yet a different gift resulting from animation by the common higher principle of life, would be required, when a person delivered a discourse on the peculiar doctrines of the faith, and when he spoke of objects that called for the exercise of Christian prudence, on the collisions between Christianity and the existing social relations, and matters relating to the outward guidance of the church. The difference is here necessarily grounded in the nature of the object, and of the human mind.

knowledge were hidden; Coloss. ii. 3; but still the agency of reason enlightened by the Holy Spirit, was necessary to bring these hidden treasures to light, to educe and develope this divine philosophy. Consequently, there would be various degrees of knowledge to be developed, and various corresponding kinds of instruction. Paul indeed speaks of a wisdom which he could deliver only among "them that are perfect;" 1 Cor. ii. 6;* but by that wisdom, he did not mean giving new explanations respecting the divine wisdom to be added from without, something distinct from the gospel as universally announced, a tradition that was to be divulged in a smaller circle of disciples. But he meant the unfolding those treasures of knowledge contained in the saving doctrine which was announced to all, and which would be brought to light by the exercise of the mental faculties, in proportion as they received and developed the objects of Christian knowledge. "The perfect," in the language of Paul, are not those who possessed a higher intellectual culture, independent of the Christian faith; but those whose whole inner life having been purified and transformed in a high degree by the vital principle of Christianity, are rendered capable of deeper Christian intelligence, by a disposition more refined from all selfish and sensual elements. In proportion as the Jewish or heathenish spirit, (and to the latter belonged the one-sided speculative tendency, the *σοφία ζήτησις*, the arrogant wisdom of the philosophical schools), still predominated among Christians, they were unsusceptible of such knowledge, and of such a kind of instruction. In like manner, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "the strong meat" of the perfect (of riper Christians), is distinguished from the

* I cannot help considering that interpretation of these words as the simplest and most agreeable to the connection, according to which, not merely a difference grounded on the various relations of one divine doctrine to the various peculiar states of the men who receive it, (inasmuch as the divine doctrine is indeed wisdom, but appears to be what it is—wisdom—only to genuine believers, to the perfect) is signified; but also an objective difference of instruction.

first elements of Christian knowledge, which were presupposed as the general foundation.

Let us now proceed from those gifts which relate to the ministry of the word, to that class which relates to other kinds of outward activity, for the advancement of the kingdom of God. Here again we must distinguish between those in which, as in *διδασκαλία*, a peculiar capability founded in human nature, and developed and applied according to its usual laws, was rendered effective, under the influence of a new divine principle of life; and those in which the natural human development was put in the back-ground, and what was more purely divine became prominent, similarly to the *γλωσσοις λαλῶν* and the *πρεφητιῶν*. To the former belong the gifts of church government, the *χαρίσμα κυβερνητικῆς* or *του προεστάναι*, and the gifts for various services, which were required in administering the concerns of the church, as distributing alms, tending the sick, &c., the *χαρίσμα διακονίας* or *ἀντιλήψεως*; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Rom. xii. 7. To the second division belongs especially the gift of working miracles, and performing cures. The charism, from which these two modes of miraculous operation proceed, considered in its essential nature, appears to be *πίστις*; 1 Cor. xii. 9; xiii. 2; Matthew xvii. 20. For the term *πίστις* in this connection cannot denote Christian faith in general, the disposition common to all Christians; but must necessarily relate to something peculiar. Indeed, as seems to follow from the relation of *πίστις* to these two modes of operation, in which a peculiar power of the will over nature manifests itself, and as is confirmed by what is predicated of *πίστις* in 1 Cor. xiii. 2. "If I had faith so that I could move mountains," i. e. could render what appeared impossible, possible by the power of religious conviction working on the Will,—the term *πίστις* evidently denotes the practical power of the will animated and elevated by faith. But with this variety in the manifestations of the charisms, still he who laboured in the power of the church, agreed with the worker of miracles, in the consciousness that all that he effected was only by the power of God granted to him; 1 Peter iv. 11.

Although, as we have shewn, in virtue of these spiritual gifts imparted to individuals, according to their various peculiarities, no one could exercise a decidedly one-sided influence on the church, but all with reciprocal activity co-operated for the same object, under the influence of one head, animating the whole in all its manifold members, Eph. iv. 16; yet it by no means followed that all guidance* of the church by human instrumen-

* We cannot, in this place, allow the view brought forward by Bauer to pass unnoticed, that, in the genuine Pauline Epistles, no trace can be found of distinct employments and offices for the guidance and government of the church. The passage in Romans xii., in which the distinctions in the various charisms are pointed out, certainly shews how fluctuating every thing was at that time, and how little those charisms will assist us as to the meaning of the later church-offices corresponding to them. In that passage, it is striking to notice how Paul, in the 8th and 9th verses, passes from the charisms which seem to relate to particular offices, to the mention of Christian virtues which concerned every believer; at the end of verse 8, the *καὶ* forms the point of transition, and even before that, *καὶ* does not necessarily relate to any official duty. Thus the view we are led to form of the original constitution of the churches among Gentile Christians, as they existed in the apostolic age,—that it was *entirely democratic*, is also one of the distinguishing marks between the churches of Gentile and those of Jewish origin. The case appears to be thus. All the affairs of the churches were still transacted in an entirely public manner, so that every deliberative meeting of the church resembled a strictly popular assembly. But it happened of course, that although no definite offices were instituted, to which certain employments were exclusively attached, yet each one occupied himself with those matters for which he possessed a peculiar charism; those who had the gift of teaching, generally attended to teaching,—those who possessed the gift of church government, occupied themselves with the duties pertaining to it. Thus, in every meeting of the church, there was a division among its members of the various business, in proportion to the peculiar charisms of individuals, yet without the institution of any definite church-offices. In favour of this view, it might further be alleged, that, when Paul (1 Cor. vi.) speaks of a matter belonging to church government, the settling of litigations, he does not recommend their committing this

tality was excluded ; but only that these specially guiding instruments, exercised no exclusive authority, did

business to persons who held a distinct office of governing, whose concern in that case it would have been ; but speaks of the church as a body, before whose tribunal such disputes ought to be brought to a decision. " Is there not *one* wise man among you (he asked) who can settle such matters ? " Therefore, such wise persons must be taken from the midst of the church, (or, in other words, those who had the gift of church government), to undertake the settlement of these disputes by means of their peculiar charism, instead of its being referred to any particular office, which perfectly agrees with the views we have stated. But this view, which indeed may be formed from such passages, though not necessarily founded upon them, is decidedly opposed by others. Paul, in 1 Cor. xvi., says, that the family of Stephanas, as the first Christian family in Achaia, devoted themselves to the service of the Christian church, i. e. its members declared themselves ready to undertake church offices ; consequently, we may suppose that, at the founding of the church, such offices were instituted. That this is his meaning, is confirmed by the 16th verse, where Paul exhorts the church to obey such (therefore rulers of the church), and all their fellow-labourers. Further, in 1 Thess. v. 12, he speaks of such who laboured for the church, presided over them, and admonished them. Love to them as overseers on account of their laborious calling is particularly enjoined ; and thus the exhortation to peace with one another concludes, since the division in the church would especially injure their proper relation to these overseers of the church, and the want of becoming love and reverence towards them would also injuriously operate against the unity of the church. When Paul, in Romans xvi. 1, mentions a deaconess, it is certainly presupposed that there were also deacons and presbyters in such a church. When, in Eph. iv. 11, he names pastors and teachers next to apostles and prophets, and indeed after the mention of charisms as the heavenly gifts bestowed by Christ, we must infer that, among these pastors and teachers, there were those who exercised distinct offices, and that, in general, certain offices corresponded to certain charisms. We intentionally pass over Philippians i. 1, a passage which can be decisive only for those who, like myself, are convinced of the genuineness of the epistle. Also, when Luke, Acts xiv. 23, narrates that Paul, on his first missionary journey, appointed presbyters in the new churches, this is, in my opinion, certain historical

not separate themselves from connection with the whole living organization, formed by a free reciprocal action of the individual members, nor dared to violate their relation to the other members, as equally serving the same head, and the same body. There was indeed for this guidance a peculiar talent inspired by the Holy Spirit, *χαρισμα κυβερνησεως*. It was this that fitted a person for the office of presiding over the church. The name of presbyter, by which, as we have before remarked, this office was first distinguished, was transferred from the Jewish synagogue to the Christian church. But when the church extended itself farther among Hellenic Gentiles, with this name borrowed from the civil and religious constitution of the Jews another was joined, which was more allied to the designations of social relations among the Greeks, and adapted to point out the official duties connected with the dignity of presbyters.* The name *ἐπισκοποι* denoted overseers over the whole of the church and its collective concerns; as in Attica those who were commissioned to organize the states dependent on Athens, received the title of *ἐπισκοποι*,† and as in ge-

evidence, since I must consider the suspicion that, in this work, a later ecclesiastical point-of-view has been transferred to earlier and differently formed church-relations as absolutely without foundation. But from the existing relations of the churches, among which there was not in the same sense, as in later times, a clergy distinguished from the laity, it is evident, how, in Romans xii. 7, along with the charisms connected with specific offices, those might be named which were not so connected; and how Paul could pass on from particular charisms to general Christian virtues. Attention to the poor and sick, which belonged to the special business of deacons, was yet something in which others could be employed, besides those on whom it officially devolved. See Rothe in the work before quoted, p. 189.

* The apostle Peter, in his first Epistle (v. 1, 2,) certainly distinguishes this dignity by the name *πρεσβυτεροι*, but the duties connected with it, by the term *ἐπισκοποι* = *ποιμαινι*.

† Otherwise called *ἀρχοντες*. Schol. Aristoph. Av. (1023) οἱ παρ' Ἀθηναίων εἰς τὰς ὑψηλοὺς πόλεις ἐπισκοπεῖσθαι τὰ παρ' ἱερεῶν ἀρχονταί, Ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ φυλακῶν ἱκαλύντο, οὗς οἱ Λακωνεῖς Ἀρχονταί εἰλεγον.

neral it appears to have been a frequent one, for denoting a guiding oversight in the public administration.* Since then, the name *ἐπισκοπος* was no other than a transference of an original Jewish and Hellenistic designation of office, adapted to the social relations of the Gentiles; it follows, that originally both names related entirely to the same office, and hence both names are frequently interchanged as perfectly synonymous. Thus Paul addresses the assembled presbyters of the Ephesian Church, whom he had sent for as *ἐπισκοπους*.† So likewise in 1 Timothy iii. 1, the office of the presbyters is called *ἐπισκοπος*, and immediately after (verse 8) the office of deacons is mentioned as the only existing church-office besides; as in Philip. i. 1. And thus Paul enjoins Titus to appoint presbyters, and immediately after calls them bishops. It is, therefore, certain that every church was governed by a union of the elders or overseers‡ chosen

* *Cic. ad Atticum*. vii. ep. 11. Vult me Pompejus esse quem tota hæc Campana et maritima ora habeat *ἐπισκοπος*, ad quam delectus et summa negotii referatur. In a fragment of a work by *Arcadius Charisius de muneribus civilibus* Episcopi qui præsumt panis et cæteris venalibus rebus, quæ civitatum populis ad quotidianum victum usui sunt. *Digest.* lib. iv. Tit. iv. leg. 18, § 7.

† Acts xx. 17 and 28. If we believed ourselves justified in supposing that among them, there were not merely the overseers of the Ephesian church, but also those of other churches in Lesser Asia, it might be said, that by these *ἐπισκοποι* only the presidents of the presbyteries are intended. But the other passages in Paul's epistles, are against such a distinction, and Luke who applies this address only to the overseers of the Ephesian church, in so doing, shews that he considered the terms *ἐπισκοπος* and *πρεσβυτερος* as perfectly synonymous.

‡ I must here again explain myself in reference to the first organization of the churches among the Gentile Christians, contrary to the view maintained by Kist and Bauer, that originally very few churches had formed themselves under individual overseers, and that their form of government from the beginning was monarchical. According to Bauer, the overseers as such in reference to their peculiar office, were *ἐπισκοποι*, and only when spoken of as united and forming a College, they were called *πρεσβυτερον*. In Acts xiv. 23, we are

from among themselves, and we find among them no individual distinguished above the rest who presided as a *primus inter pares*, though, probably, in the age immediately succeeding the apostolic, of which we have unfortunately so few authentic memorials, the practice was introduced of applying to such an one the name of *πρωτοπρεσβυτης* by way of distinction.* We have no information how the office of president in the deliberations of presbyters was held in the apostolic age. Possibly this office was held in rotation—or the order of seniority might be followed—or, by degrees, one individual by his personal qualifications gain such a distinction; all this, in the absence of information must be left undetermined; one thing

told, that Paul appointed presbyters for the churches, formed in the different cities, that is, in each church a college of presbyters. If, with Bauer, we understand, that the plurality of presbyters is to be taken collectively, and for each church only one presbyter was appointed, this would be inconsistent with Acts xx. 17, where it is said, that Paul sent for the presbyters of the church at Ephesus, which implies that a plurality of presbyters presided over one church; or the word *ἐκκλησία*, which in the passage first quoted is understood of a single church, must be here arbitrarily taken to signify several churches collectively—certainly quite contrary to the phraseology of the apostolic age, according to which, the word *ἐκκλησία* signifies, either the whole Christian church, the total number of believers, forming one body, under one head, or a single church or Christian society. In that case, the plural *τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν* must necessarily have been used. Acts xx. 28, also implies, that over each church a plurality of presbyters presided. And thus, we must also explain Titus i. 5, which explanation (of the appointment of several presbyters in each city) is also most favoured by the language there used. I can discover no other difference between the *πρεσβυτερι* and *πρωτοπρεσβυτης* in the apostolic age, than that the first signifies the rank, the second the duties of the office, whether the reference is to one or more.

* Perhaps an analogy may be found, in the fact (if it were so), that one among the Jewish presbyters was distinguished by the name of Archisynagogos; or the names *πρεσβυτερι* and *ἀρχισυναγωγοι* may bear the same relation to each other, as *πρεσβυτερι* and *πρωτοπρεσβυτης*, the first name denoting the rank, the second the nature of the office, *ἀρχωντες τῆς συναγωγῆς*.

Yet as, by the participation of all in the conduct of church affairs, a regular government by appointed organs was not excluded, but both co-operated for the general good; so also together with that which the members of the church, by virtue of the common Christian inspiration, could contribute to their mutual edification, there existed a regular administration of instruction in the church, and an oversight of the transmission and development of doctrine, which in this time of restlessness and ferment was exposed to so many adulterations, and for this purpose the *χρησμός* of *διδασκαλία* was designed. There were

to the first interpretation, it supposes too great a difference between the *διδασκίαι*—which must also proceed from an operation of the Holy Spirit—and the *προφητείας* in reference to the divine in both. It must be certainly erroneous to suppose that any operation whatever of the Holy Spirit in the Christian church could be lawless. When the apostle Paul points out to the female that place in the church which is assigned her by the spirit of the gospel, which sanctifies nature—the Holy Spirit which is the Spirit of Christianity, follows everywhere this law in his operations, and we cannot suppose that by an exception he would remove Woman from her natural position. Every deviation of this kind would appear as something morbid, and contrary to the spirit of the gospel.

Besides, when Paul gave that prohibition in reference to females, he was treating of addresses that were *not didactic*. This could therefore make no exception, which would apply to both interpretations. We must account for this apparent contradiction, by supposing that Paul, in the second passage, merely cited an instance of what occurred in the Corinthian church, and reserved his censures for another place. One of the reasons which Paul adduces in the passage quoted from the first Epistle to Timothy against the public speaking of females, is the greater danger of self-deception in the weaker sex, and the spread of errors arising from it—a reason which would apply with the greatest force to a class of addresses, in which sober reflectiveness was least of all in exercise. But this kind of religious utterance would be most suited to the female sex, where no danger of the sort alluded to, arising from publicity, would be connected with it—only it must be confined to the domestic circle. Hence the daughters of Philip, Acts xxi. 9, notwithstanding that rule, could act as prophetesses, unless we assume that this was an instance which Paul would have censured.

three orders of teachers in the apostolic age. The first place is occupied by those who were personally chosen and set apart by Christ, and formed by intercourse with him to be instruments for publishing the gospel among all mankind—the witnesses of his discourses, his works, his sufferings, and his resurrection—the Apostles,* among whom Paul was justly included, on account of Christ's personal appearance to him and the illumination of his mind independently of the instructions of the other apostles; next to these, were the Missionaries or Evangelists, *ευαγγελισται*;† and lastly, the Teachers appointed for separate churches, and taken out of their body, the *διδασκαλοι*. If sometimes the *πρεφηται* are named next to the apostles and set before the evangelists and the *διδασκαλοις*, such teachers must be meant in whom that inward condition of life, from which *πρεφηται* proceeded, was more constant, who were distinguished from other teachers by the extraordinary liveliness and steadiness of the Christian inspiration, and a peculiar originality of their Christian conceptions which were imparted to them by special *αποκα-*

* This name in a general sense was applied to others who published divine truth in an extensive sphere of labour.

† This name does not imply that they occupied themselves with collecting and compiling narratives of the life of Christ; for the name *ευαγγελισται* originally denoted nothing else than the whole announcement of the salvation granted through Christ to men, and this announcement embraced the whole of Christianity. As this announcement rests on a historical basis, Christ as the Redeemer is the object of it; and thus the later-derived meaning is formed in which this word is especially applied to the histories of the Life of Christ. According to the original Christian phraseology, the term could only denote one whose calling it was to publish the doctrine of salvation to men, and thereby to lay a foundation for the Christian church; on the contrary, the *διδασκαλος* presupposed faith in the doctrine of salvation, and a church already founded, and employed himself in the farther training in Christian knowledge. The use of the word *ευαγγελιστης* in 2 Tim. iv. 5, favours this interpretation, and this original Christian phraseology was continued in later ages, although a more modern meaning of the word *ευαγγελισται* was connected with it.—*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* iii. c. 37.

πνεύματος of the Holy Spirit; and indeed these prophets, as is evident from their position between the apostles and evangelists, belonged to the class of teachers who held no office in any one church, but travelled about, to publish the gospel in a wider circle.

As it regards the relation of the διδασκαλοι to the πρεσβυτεροι or επισκοποι, we dare not proceed on the supposition, that they always remained the same from the first establishment of Christian churches among the Gentiles, and therefore during the whole of Paul's ministry, a period so important for the development of the church; and hence we are not justified to conclude, from the characteristics we find in the later Pauline Epistles, that the relation of these orders was the same as existed from the beginning in the Gentile churches. If we find several things in earlier documents which are at variance with these characteristics, the supposition must at least appear possible, that changes in the condition of the churches, and the experiences of the first period, had occasioned an alteration in this respect; and it is an utterly unfounded conclusion, if, because traces of such an altered relation are found in an epistle ascribed to Paul, any one should infer that such an epistle could not have been written in the Pauline period. The first question then is, What was the original relation? If we proceed on the supposition, which is founded on the Pastoral Letters, that the διδασκαλοι belonged to the overseers of the churches, two cases may be imagined; either that all the presbyters or bishops held also the office of teachers; or, that some among them, according to their peculiar talent (χαρισμα), were specially employed in the management of the outward guidance of the church (the κυβερνησις), and others with the internal guidance of the word (the διδασκαλια), we shall thus have πρεσβυτεροι κυβερνηται = ποιμεις and πρεσβυτεροι διδασκοι = διδασκαλοι. The first case certainly cannot be admitted, for the χαρισμα of κυβερνησις is so decidedly distinct from the χαρισμα of διδασκαλια, as in common life the talent for governing and the talent for teaching, are perfectly distinct from one another. And according to the original institution

the peculiar office corresponded to the peculiar charism. But since in the latter part of the Pauline period, those presbyters who were equally capable of the office of teachers as well as governors, were especially commended, it is evident that this was not originally the case with all. But neither have we sufficient reason for considering the second case, as the original relation of these several offices. Since the *χαρισμα* of *πρεσβυται* or *κυβερνῆται* (in the First Epistle to the Corinthians xii. 28, and in the Epistle to the Romans xii. 8), is so accurately distinguished from the talent of teaching,—and since these two characteristics, the *πρεσβυται* and the *κυβερνῆται*, evidently exhaust what belonged from the beginning to the office of presbyter or bishop, and for which it was originally instituted, we are not obliged to conclude that the *διδασκαλοι* belonged to the class of overseers of the church.

In the Epistle written at a late period to the Ephesians (iv. 11), the *ποιμεις* and *διδασκαλοι*, are so far placed together, that they are both distinguished from those who presided over a general sphere of labour, but yet only in that respect. Now the term *ποιμεις*, denotes exactly the office of rulers of the church, the presbyters or bishops; it therefore does not appear evident that we should class the *διδασκαλοι* with them. On the other hand, the term *ποιμεις* might be applied not improperly to *διδασκαλοι*, since in itself, and from the manner in which the image of a shepherd is used in the Old Testament and by Christ himself, it is fitted to denote the guidance of souls by the office of teaching. Paul also classes *διδασκ* with those addresses which are not connected with holding a particular office (1 Cor. xiv. 26), but what every one in the church who had an inward call, and an ability for it, was justified in exercising.

It might also happen, that in a church after its presbytery had already been established, persons belonging to it might come forward, or new members might be added, who, in consequence of their previous education, distinguished themselves in the office of teaching, even more than the existing presbyters, which would soon be evi-

dent from the addresses they delivered when the church assembled. At this season of the first free development of the Christian life, would the charism granted to such persons be neglected or repressed, merely because they did not belong to the class of presbyters? There were, as it appears, some members of the church in whose dwellings a portion of them used to assemble, and this depended probably not always on the convenient locality of their residence, but on their talent for teaching, which was thus rendered available; as Aquila, who though he resided sometimes at Rome, sometimes at Corinth, or at Ephesus, always wherever he took up his abode had a small congregation or church in his own house. (*ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ*).^{*} Thus originally the

* The occurrence of such private churches is made use of by Kist and Bauer as an argument for their opinion, that originally in the larger cities there were only insulated particular churches, under their own guiding presbyters, which were formed in various parts, and at a subsequent period, were united into one whole. But the Epistles of the apostle Paul give the clearest evidence that all the Christians of one city originally formed one whole church. Yet we may easily suppose that some parts of the church, without separating themselves from the whole body and its guidance, held particular meetings in the house of some person whose locality was very suitable, and who acted as the *διδασκαλος* for the edification of such small assemblies. Thus it may be explained how Aquila and Priscilla, while they sojourned at Rome, or Corinth, or Ephesus, might have such a small Christian society in their own house. Yet it does not seem right to consider these as absolutely separate and distinct churches; for we could not suppose that such a company of believers would be waiting for the arrival of a person like Aquila, who so often changed his residence; they must have had a fixed place of assembling, and their appointed overseers, (a presbyter or bishop, according to that supposition). In 1 Cor. xvi. 20, the church, forming one whole (all the brethren), is expressly distinguished from any such partial assembly. In Romans xvi. 23, a brother is mentioned, in whose house the whole church held their meetings. In Coloss. iv. 15, after a salutation to the whole church, an individual is specified and included in the salutation, at whose house such private meetings were held. But it may be questioned whether in such places

the office of overseer of the church, might have nothing in common with the communication of instruction. Although the overseers of the church took cognisance not only of the good conduct of its members, but also of that which would be considered as forming its basis, the maintenance of pure doctrine, and the exclusion of error; and though from the beginning care would be taken, to appoint persons to this office, who had attained to maturity and steadiness in their Christian principles, it did not follow that they must possess the gift of teaching, and in addition to their other labours occupy themselves in public addresses. It might be, that at first the *διδασκαλία* was generally not connected with a distinct office, but that those who were fitted for it came forward in the public assemblies as *διδασκαλοι*; until it came to pass that those who were specially furnished with the *χρησμα* of *διδασκαλία*, of whom there would naturally be only a few in most churches, were considered as those on whom the stated delivery of instruction devolved. In the Epistle to the Galatians (vi. 6), Paul may be thought to intimate* that there were already teachers

as Romans xvi. 14, 15, ("Salute Asyncritus—and the brethren that are with them.") "Salute Philologus—and all the saints that are with them,") meetings of this kind are intended or only those persons who, on account of their family ties or connections in business, lived in intimacy with one another.

* Even after the reasons alleged by Schott against this interpretation, in his commentary on this Epistle, I cannot help considering it as the only natural one. And I cannot agree with the other, according to which the *πᾶσι ἀγαθοῖς* is understood in a spiritual sense, (following the example of their teachers in all that is good). I cannot suppose that Paul, if he wished to admonish the Galatians to follow the example of their teachers in the Christian life, would have expressed himself in so obscure and spiritless a manner. As to the objection against the first interpretation, that it does not suit the connection, I cannot admit its correctness. The exhortations to gentleness and humility in social intercourse, introduce the series of special exhortations. V. 26, vi. 6, where the *καὶ* marks the continued development, a new exhortation follows, namely, that they should be ready to communicate of their earthly goods to their teachers; then v. 7,

appointed by the church, who ought to receive their maintenance from them. But the question arises, whether these words relate to the *διδασκαλοι*, or to the itinerant *επαγγελισται*; also, whether the passage speaks, not of any regular salary, but of the contributions of free love, by which the immediate wants of these missionaries were relieved. At all events,—which would also be confirmed by this latter passage, in case it is understood of *διδασκαλοι*, these were and continued to be distinct from the overseers of the church in general, although in particular cases the talents of teaching and governing were connected, and the presbyter was equally able as a teacher.

At a later period, when the pure gospel had to combat with manifold errors, which threatened to corrupt it—as was especially the case during the latter period of Paul's ministry,—at this critical period it was thought necessary to unite more closely the offices of teachers and overseers, and with that view to take care that overseers should be appointed, who would be able by their public instructions to protect the church from the infection of false doctrine, to establish others in purity of faith, and to convince the gainsayers; Titus i. 9; and hence he esteemed those presbyters who laboured likewise in the office of teaching, as deserving of special honour.

We have already remarked, that only females were excluded from the right of speaking in the public meetings of the church. But yet the gifts peculiar to their sex might be made available for the outward service of the church, in rendering assistance of various kinds, for which women are peculiarly fitted; and according to existing social habits, a deacon in many of his official employments might excite suspicion in reference to his conduct towards the female members of the church; but

that they must not think of reaping the fruits of the gospel, if their conduct was not formed agreeably to it; if they; with all their care directed only to earthly things, neglected such a duty towards those who laboured for the salvation of their souls.

it was desirable by all means to guard against such an imputation on the new religious sect, of which men were easily inclined to believe evil, because it was new and opposed to the popular faith. Hence the office of deaconess was instituted in addition to that of deacon, probably first in the churches of Gentile Christians. Of its institution and nature in the apostolic age we have no precise information, since we find it explicitly mentioned in only one passage of the New Testament; Romans xvi. 1. In modern times, indeed, what Paul says in 1 Tim. v. 3-16, of the widows who received their maintenance from the church, has been applied to these deaconesses. And many qualifications which he requires of those who were to be admitted into the number of the widows (v. 10), and which appear to contain a reference to their special employments, as attention to strangers and the care of the poor, are in favour of the supposition. But since Paul only distinguished them as persons supported by the church,* without mentioning any active service as devolving upon them; since he represents them as persons who, as suited their age and condition, were removed from all occupation with earthly concerns, and dedicated their few remaining days to devotion and prayer; and since, on the contrary, the office of deaconess certainly involved much active employment; we have no ground whatever for finding in this passage deaconesses, or females out of whose number deaconesses were chosen.† What Paul says in the pas-

* I do not perceive how Bauer can trace in the 5th chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, that at that time the name *χρησται* was applied to young unmarried females, in reference to their station in the church, which would be among the marks of a writing composed at a later period. The *οὐτως χρησται* in v. 5, are the truly destitute, who could find relief only in the church for their loneliness, contrasted with the widows mentioned in verse 4, who were supported by their own relations, instead of being a burden to the church. The *χρησται* = *μεινον-μνη*, verse 5, where the *και* is to be understood *explicative*.

† The supposition, that in v. 9, mention is made of a different class of widows than those in v. 3, appears to me utterly untenable. A comparison of v. 16, with v. 4 and 8,

sage quoted above of the deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, appears by no means to agree with what is said in the First Epistle to Timothy, concerning the age and destitute condition of widows. We must rather imagine such females to be among those widows who, after presenting a model in discharging their duties as Christian wives and mothers, would now obtain repose and a place of honour in the bosom of the church where alone they could find a refuge in their loneliness; and by their devotional spiritual life, set an edifying example to other females; perhaps also they might be able to communicate to such of their sex as sought their advice, the results of their Christian experience collected in the course of a long life, and make a favourable impression even on the Gentiles. Hence it would naturally be an occasion of scandal, if such persons quitted a life of retirement and devotion, and shewed a fondness for habits that were inconsistent with their matronly character. At all events, we find here an ecclesiastical arrangement of later date, which is also indicated by other parts of the Epistle.

The consecration to offices in the church was conducted in the following manner. After those persons to whom its performance belonged, had laid their hands on the head of the candidate,—a symbolic action borrowed from the Jewish *קִמְיָה*,—they besought the Lord that he would grant, what this symbol denoted, the impartation of the gifts of his Spirit for carrying on the office thus undertaken in his name. If, as was presumed, the whole ceremony corresponded to its intent, and the requisite disposition existed in those for whom it was performed, there was reason for considering the communication of the spiritual gifts necessary for the office, as connected with this consecration performed in the name of Christ. And since Paul from this point of view designated the whole of the solemn proceeding, (without separating it into its various elements), by that which was

plainly shews that this whole section relates to the same subject.

its external symbol (as in scriptural phraseology, a single act of a transaction consisting of several parts, and sometimes that which was most striking to the senses, is often mentioned for the whole;) he required of Timothy that he should seek to revive afresh the spiritual gifts that he had received by the laying on of hands.

Respecting the election to offices in the church, it is evident that the first deacons, and the delegates who were authorized by the church to accompany the apostles, were chosen from the general body; 2 Cor. viii. 19. From these examples, we may conclude that a similar mode of proceeding was adopted at the appointment of presbyters. But from the fact that Paul committed to his disciples Timothy and Titus (to whom he assigned the organization of new churches, or of such as had been injured by many corruptions), the appointment likewise of presbyters and deacons, and called their attention to the qualifications for such offices, we are by no means justified in concluding that they performed all this alone without the co-operation of the churches. The manner in which Paul was wont to address himself to the whole church, and to take into account the co-operation of the whole community, which must be apparent to every one in reading his Epistles,—leads us to expect, that where a church was already established, he would admit it as a party in their common concerns. It is possible, that the apostle himself in many cases, as on the founding of a new church, might think it advisable to nominate the persons best fitted for such offices, and a proposal from such a quarter would naturally carry the greatest weight with it. In the example of the family of Stephanas at Corinth, we see that those who first undertook office in the church, were members of the family first converted in that city.

It was also among the churches of the Gentile Christians that the peculiar nature of the Christian worship was fully expressed in the character of their cultus. For among the Jewish Christians the ancient forms of the Jewish cultus were still retained, though persons of this class who were deeply imbued with the spirit of the

gospel, and hence had acquired the essence of inward spiritual worship, which is limited to no place or time ; —were made free as it regarded their inward life from the thralldom of these forms, and had learned to refine these forms by viewing them in the light of the gospel. Such persons thought that the powers of the future world which they were conscious of having received, would still continue to operate in these forms belonging to the ancient economy, until that future world and the whole of its new heavenly economy would arrive, by means of the return of Christ to complete his kingdom,—a decisive era which appeared to them not far distant. On the contrary, among the Gentiles the free spiritual worship of God developed itself in direct opposition to Judaism and the attempts to mingle Judaism and Christianity. According to the doctrine of the apostle Paul, the Mosaic law in its whole extent had lost its value as such to Christians ; nothing could be a rule binding on Christians on account of its being contained in the Mosaic law ; but, whatever was binding as a law for the Christian life, must as such derive its authority from another quarter. Hence a transference of the Old Testament command of the sanctity of the Sabbath to the New Testament standingpoint was not admissible. Whoever considered himself subject to one such command, in Paul's judgment again placed himself under the yoke of the whole law ; his inward life was thereby brought into servitude to outward earthly things, and sinking into Jewish nationalism, denied the universalism of the gospel ; for on the standing-point of the gospel, the whole life became in an equal manner related to God, and served to glorify him, and thenceforth no opposition existed between what belonged to the world and what belonged to God. Thus all the days of the Christian life must be equally holy to the Lord ; hence Paul says to the Galatian Christians, who had allowed themselves to be so far led astray as to acknowledge the Mosaic law as binding, and to observe the Jewish feasts, "After that ye have known God, or rather (by his pitying love) have been led to the knowledge of God, how turn ye

again* to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?"† Gal. iv. 9. He fears that his labours among them to make them Christians had been in vain, and for this very reason, because they reckoned the observance of certain days as holy to be an essential part of religion. The apostle does not here oppose the Christian feasts to the Jewish, but he considers the whole reference of religion to certain days as something foreign to the exalted standing-point of Christian freedom, and belonging to that of Judaism and Heathenism. With a similar polemical view (in Coloss. ii. 16) he declares his opposition to those who considered the observation of certain days as essential to religion, and condemned those who did not observe them. Although, in the Epistle to the Romans, xiv. 1-6, he en-

* Thus he spoke to those who had formerly been heathens; for although in other points Judaism might be considered as opposed to heathenism, yet he viewed as an element common to both, the cleaving to outward forms.

† I have translated this passage according to the sense; more literally it would be,—"or rather are known by God"—Living in estrangement from him, they lived in spiritual darkness, in ignorance of God and of divine things; but now by the mercy of God revealing itself to them, they obtained living communion with him, and the true knowledge of him. After Paul had contrasted their present standing-point of divine knowledge with that of their former ignorance, he corrects himself, in order not to let it be imagined that they were indebted simply to the exercise of their own reason for this knowledge of God, and represents in strong terms, that they were indebted for every thing to divine grace, the grace of redemption. Therefore, they were guilty of ingratitude, in not making use of the knowledge vouchsafed to them by the grace of God. Had it been possible for Paul, according to the idiom of the Greek, to mark by a passive form of the same word *γινώσκω*, the contrast between a received knowledge imparted by God, and a knowledge gained by the exercise of the mental powers alone, he would for that purpose have used the passive form. This, indeed, the laws of the Greek language did not permit; but yet the passive form, according to his customary Hellenistic idiom, gave him an opportunity to mark the contrast which he had in his mind still more strongly.

joins forbearance towards such in whom the Christian spirit was not yet developed with true freedom, yet he certainly considers it as the most genuine Christianity—to think every day alike, to hold none as peculiarly sacred to the Lord; the *κεῖνον πᾶσαν ἡμέραν—μὴ θεωρεῖν κυρίαν τὴν ἡμέραν*.

It is worthy of notice, that Paul in such passages entirely rejects even festive observances, as they were considered among Gentiles and Jews as something absolutely essential to religion, and does not even mention any days which might be expressly sacred in a freer method, and suited to Christianity, Christian feasts properly so called. So far was he from thinking that on the Christian standing-point, there could be days which could in any manner bear a resemblance to what in the Jewish sense was a feast, or that it was necessary to set apart any day whatever as specially to be observed by the Church! From such passages we may conclude, that, in the Gentile Churches, all days of the week were considered alike suitable for the service of the Church; and that all preference of one day to another was regarded as quite foreign to the genius of the gospel.

A perfectly unquestionable and decided mention of the ecclesiastical observance of Sunday among the Gentile Christians, we cannot find in the times of the apostle Paul, but there are two passages which make its existence probable. If, what Paul says, 1 Cor. xii. 2, relates to collections which were made at the meetings of the church, it would be evident from this passage that at that time the Sunday was specially devoted to such meetings. But Paul, if we examine his language closely, says no more than this: that every one should lay by in his own house on the first day of the week, whatever he was able to save. This certainly might mean, that every one should bring with him the sum he had saved to the meeting of the church, that thus the individual contributions might be collected together, and be ready for Paul as soon as he came. But this would be making a gratuitous supposition, not at all required by the connec-

tion of the passage.* We may fairly understand the whole passage to mean, that every one on the first day of the week should lay aside what he could spare, so that when Paul came, every one might be prepared with the total of the sum thus laid by, and then, by putting the sums together, the collection of the whole church would be at once made. If we adopt this interpretation, we could not infer that special meetings of the church were held and collections made on Sundays. And if we assume that, independently of the influence of Christianity, the Jewish reckoning by weeks, had been adopted among the heathen in the Roman Empire; still in this passage we can find no evidence for the existence of a religious distinction of Sunday. But since we are not authorized to make this assumption unless a church consisted for the most part of those who had been Jewish Proselytes,† we shall be led to infer that the religious observances of Sunday occasioned its being considered the first day of the week. It is also mentioned in Acts xx. 7, that the church at Troas assembled on a Sunday and celebrated the Lord's Supper. Here the question arises, whether Paul put off his departure from Troas to the next day, because he wished to celebrate the Sunday with this church—or whether the church met on the Sunday (though they might have met on any other day), because Paul had fixed to leave Troas on the following day.

At all events, we must deduce the origin of the religious observance of Sunday, not from the Jewish-Christian churches, but from the peculiar circumstances of the Gentile Christians, and may account for the practice in the following manner. Where the circumstances of the churches did not allow of daily meetings for devotion and agapæ—although in the nature of Christianity no necessity could exist for such a distinction—although on

* The word *συναγίζω*, 1 Cor. xvi. 2, applied to setting aside the small sums weekly, is against the notion of a public collection.

† See Ideler's *Chronologie*, i. 180.

the Christian standing-point all days were to be considered as equally holy, in an equal manner devoted to the Lord—yet on account of peculiar outward relations, such a distinction of a particular day was adopted for religious communion. They did not choose the Sabbath which the Jewish Christians celebrated, in order to avoid the risk of mingling Judaism and Christianity, and because another event was more closely associated with Christian sentiments. The sufferings and resurrection of Christ appeared as the central-point of Christian knowledge and practice; since his resurrection was viewed as the foundation of all Christian joy and hope, it was natural that the day which was connected with the remembrance of this event, should be specially devoted to Christian communion.

But if a weekly day was thus distinguished in the churches of Gentile Christians, still it is very doubtful that any yearly commemoration of the resurrection was observed among them. Some have endeavoured to find in 1 Cor. v. 7, a reference to a Christian passover to be celebrated in a Christian sense with a decided reference to Christian truth: but we can find a reference only to a Jewish passover, which was still celebrated by the Jewish Christians. When Paul was writing those words, the Jews and Jewish Christians were present to his imagination, as on the fourteenth of Nisan, they carefully searched every corner of their houses, lest any morsel of leaven should have escaped their notice. This practice of outward Judaism he applies in a spiritualized sense to Christians. "Purify yourselves from the old leaven (the leaven of your old nature, which still cleaves to you from your old corruption), that you may become a new mass (meaning renewed and justified human nature), and as it were unleavened; that is, purified by Christ from the leaven of sin, as elsewhere Paul represents purification from sin, the being dead to sin as connected with the death of Christ,* for Christ has been offered

* This is no doubt the simplest interpretation of the words *οἱ ἄζυμοι*, "as ye are unleavened," purified as re-

as our paschal lamb: they ought ever to remember that true paschal lamb, by whose offering they were truly freed from sin; the Jewish passover was henceforth wholly useless. Therefore, as men purified from sin by Christ our paschal lamb, let us celebrate the feast, not after the manner of the Jews, who swept the leaven out of their houses, but retained the leaven of old corruption in their hearts—but let us so celebrate it that we may be a mass purified in heart from the leaven of sin." In all this, there is evidently no reference to the celebration of a Christian passover among Gentile Christians, but only the contrast of the spiritual passover, comprehending the whole life of the redeemed, with the merely outward Jewish feast.*

The celebration of the two symbols of Christian communion, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, belonged to the unchangeable plan of the Christian church, as framed by its Divine Founder; these rites were to be recognised equally by Jews and Gentiles, and no alteration would be made in reference to them by the peculiar formation of ecclesiastical life among the Gentiles; we need therefore to add little to what we have before remarked. In Baptism, entrance into communion with Christ appears to have been the essential point; thus persons were united to the spiritual body of Christ and received into the communion of the redeemed, the church

deemed persons, for ever from the *ζυμὴ τῆς ἀμαρτίας*. But, if with Grotius, we understand the words according to the analogy of the Greek *ἀσυνος, ἀσυνος*, "as ye eat no leaven," and thus are equivalent to, "as ye celebrate the feast of unleavened bread, or the Passover," still this may be understood only of a spiritual passover; for otherwise it would not agree with that which is afterwards adduced as a reason, and it would also be implied, that the Gentile Christians had refrained from leavened bread at Easter, which Paul, on his principles, could not have allowed.

* If we supposed that these words related to an Easter feast, celebrated among the Gentile Christians, it would follow that they celebrated this feast at the same time as the Jews, and then it would hardly be possible to explain the rise of the disputes relative to the time of observing Easter.

of Christ; Gal. iii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13. Hence baptism, according to its characteristic marks, was designated a baptism into Christ, into the name of Christ, as the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah was the original article of faith in the apostolic church, and this was probably the most ancient * formula of baptism, which was still made use of even in the third century (see my Church History, vol. i. p. 546). The usual form of submersion at baptism, practised by the Jews, was transferred to the Gentile Christians. Indeed, this form was the most suitable to signify that which Christ intended to render an object of contemplation by such a symbol; the immersion of the whole man in the spirit of a new life. But Paul availed himself of what was accidental to the form of this symbol, the twofold act of submersion and of emersion, to which Christ certainly made no reference at the institution of the symbol. As he found therein a reference to Christ Dead, and Christ Risen, the negative and positive aspect of the Christian life—in the imitation of Christ to die to all ungodliness, and in communion with him to rise to a new divine life,—so in the given form of baptism, he made use of what was accessory in order to represent by a sensible image, the idea and design of the rite in its connection with the whole essence of Christianity.

Since baptism marked the entrance into communion with Christ, it resulted from the nature of the rite, that a confession of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer would be made by the person to be baptized; and in the latter part of the apostolic age, we may find indications of the existence of such a practice.† As baptism was closely

* In the Shepherd of Hermas (visio iii. c. 7), in Fabricii cod. apocr. Nov. Test. p. 804, it is said, *baptisavi in nomine Domini*.

† These indications are such as will not amount to incontrovertible certainty. We find the least doubtful reference in 1 Peter iii. 21, but the interpretation even of this passage has been much disputed. If the words are understood in this sense, "a question according to a good conscience in relation to God, by means of the resurrection of Christ," a question

united with a conscious entrance on Christian communion, faith and baptism were always connected with one another; and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only in instances where both could meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period. We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instance of the baptism of whole families, for the passage in 1 Cor. xvi. 16, shews the fallacy of such a conclusion, as from that it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, who were

proposed at baptism might be inferred from it, of which the purport would be, whether a person believed in the resurrection of Christ, as the pledge of the forgiveness of sins granted to him, and hence would think of God in this faith with a good conscience. But Winer against such an interpretation of the passage justly objects, that in this case, the answer given by the candidate as an expression of his confession of his faith, of what peculiarly related to salvation, and not the question, must have been mentioned. Yet Winer's explanation (in his Grammar) in reference to the word *ἰσχυροῦς*,—the seeking of a good conscience after God,—although *ἰσχυρὸς* is in the Hellenistic idiom, as the passage adduced by Winer shews, may have this meaning—does not appear the most natural. If Paul had wished to say this, would he not have preferred using the form *ἰσχυροῦς*? And might it not be said against this interpretation, that the apostle would have represented that which saved at baptism, not the seeking after God, but the finding God through Christ, the longing for communion with him, according to the analogy of scriptural representations on this subject.

But what Peter wished particularly to point out, was the spiritual character of the whole baptismal rite, in opposition to a mere outward sensible purification. This spiritual character might be pointed out by the question proposed at baptism, which referred to the spiritual religious object of the rite, and the question is alluded to instead of the answer, because it precedes and is that which gives occasion to the answer, and thus the first interpretation may be justified.

The second trace of such a baptismal confession is found in 1 Tim. vi. 12, but it is not quite evident, that a confession of this kind is intended; it might be only one which Timothy had given from the free impulse of feeling, when he was set apart to be the associate of Paul in publishing the gospel.

baptized by Paul, consisted of adults. That not till so late a period as (at least certainly not earlier than) Irenæus, a trace of infant baptism appears, and that it first became recognised as an apostolic tradition in the course of the third century, is evidence rather *against* than *for* the admission of its apostolic origin; especially since, in the spirit of the age when Christianity appeared, there were many elements which must have been favourable to the introduction of infant baptism,—the same elements from which proceeded the notion of the magical effects of outward baptism, the notion of its absolute necessity for salvation, the notion which gave rise to the mythus that the apostles baptized the Old Testament saints in Hades. How very much must infant baptism have corresponded with such a tendency, if it had been favoured by tradition! It might indeed be alleged, on the other hand, that after infant baptism had long been recognised as an apostolic tradition, many other causes hindered its universal introduction, and the same causes might still earlier stand in the way of its spread although a practice sanctioned by the apostles. But these causes could not have acted in this manner, in the post-apostolic age. In later times, we see the opposition between theory and practice, in this respect, actually coming forth. Besides, it is a different thing, that a practice which could not altogether deny the marks of its later institution, although at last recognised as of apostolic founding, could not for a length of time pervade the life of the church; and that a practice really proceeding from apostolic institution and tradition, notwithstanding the authority that introduced it, and the circumstances in its favour arising from the spirit of the times, should yet not have been generally adopted. And if we wish to ascertain from whom such an institution was originated, we should say, certainly not immediately from Christ himself. Was it from the primitive church in Palestine, from an injunction given by the earlier apostles? But among the Jewish Christians, circumcision was held as a seal of the covenant, and hence, they had so much less occasion to make use of another dedication for their children.

Could it then have been Paul, who first among heathen Christians introduced this alteration by the use of baptism. But this would agree least of all with the peculiar Christian characteristics of this apostle. He who says of himself that Christ sent him not to baptize but to preach the gospel; he who always kept his eye fixed on one thing, justification by faith, and so carefully avoided every thing which could give a handle or support to the notion of a justification by outward things (the *erga*)—how could he have set up infant baptism against the circumcision that continued to be practised by the Jewish Christians? In this case, the dispute carried on with the Judaizing party, on the necessity of circumcision, would easily have given an opportunity of introducing this substitute into the controversy, if it had really existed. The evidence arising from silence on this topic, has therefore the greater weight.* We

* If it could be shewn, that at this time there was a practice of administering to living persons a substitutionary baptism for the dead, an interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 19, which has been lately advocated by Rückert—this would stand in striking contradiction with the absence of infant-baptism. If so unconditional a necessity was ascribed to outward baptism, and such a magical power for the salvation of men, as to have occasioned the introduction of such a practice, from such a standing-point men must have been brought much sooner to the practice of infant-baptism. But although the explanation here proposed, arises from the most natural interpretation of the words, I cannot assent to it, since it does not satisfy other conditions of a correct exegesis. What idea can we form of such a practice of substitutionary baptism? Was it that persons hoped by means of it, to save their deceased friends and relatives, and those who had remained far from the faith? But since at that time such stress was laid on the necessity of repentance and faith, we are at a loss to conceive how such an error and abuse could gain acceptance. The supposition of this necessity lies at the foundation of the mythus of the baptism administered in Hades to the saints of the Old Testament. We might rather suppose that if persons who had become believers died before they could fulfil their resolution of being baptized—a substitutionary baptism would be made use of for *them*. But in such cases, it would have been more consonant to a superstitious adherence to an out-

find, indeed, in one passage of Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 14, a trace, that already the children of Christians were distinguished from the children of heathens, and might be considered in a certain sense as belonging to the church, but this is not deduced from their having partaken of baptism, and this mode of connection with the church is rather evidence against the existence of infant baptism. The apostle is here treating of the sanctifying influence of the communion between parents and children, by which the children of Christian parents would be distinguished from the children of those who were not

ward rite, that they should have hastened to impart baptism to the dying, or even to the dead, and we find traces of both these practices in later times. Of a substitutionary baptism, on the contrary, no trace can be found, with the exception of the single passage in Paul's writings. An improper appeal has been made on this point to Tertullian. He says, *de resurrectione carnis*, c. 48, only what he believed was to be found in these words of Paul, without referring to any other quarter. In his work against Marcion, v. 10, he also refers to this passage, and such a substitutionary baptism appeared to him as somewhat analogous to the heathenish purgations for the dead on the 1st of February, the *Februationes*. He thought it important to remark, that Paul could not have approved of such a practice. "Viderit institutio ista. Kalendæ si forte Februaris respondebunt illi: pro mortuis petere. Noli ergo apostolum novum statim auctorem aut confirmatorem ejus denotare, ut tanto magis sisteret carnis resurrectionem, quanto illi qui vane pro mortuis baptizarentur, fide resurrectionis hoc facerent." And he himself afterwards proposes another interpretation of the passage, according to which there is no allusion to a substitutionary baptism. Later uneducated Marcionites in Syria had most probably from this passage of St Paul's, adopted a practice altogether at variance with the spirit of Marcion. Besides, we might suppose that Paul employed an *argumentum ad hominem*, and adduced a superstitious custom as evidence of a truth lying at the foundation of Christian knowledge. But still it is difficult to suppose that Paul, who so zealously opposed all dependence on outward things, and treated it as the worst adulteration of the gospel, should not from the first have expressed himself in the strongest terms against such a delusion.

Christian, and in virtue of which they might in a certain sense be termed *αγία*, in contrast with the *ἡεθνητα*.* But if infant baptism had been then in existence, the epithet *αγία*, applied to Christian children would have been deduced only from this sacred rite by which they had become incorporated with the Christian Church. But in the point of view here chosen by Paul, we find (although it testifies against the existence of infant baptism) the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards necessarily developed, and by which it must be justified to agree with Paul's sentiments; an indication of the pre-eminence belonging to children born in a Christian community; the consecration for the kingdom of God, which is thereby granted to them, an immediate sanctifying influence which would communicate itself to their earliest development.†

* The immediate impressions—which proceed from the whole of the intercourse of life, and by means of the natural feeling of dependence of children on their parents, pass from the latter to the former—have a far stronger hold than the effects of instruction, and such impressions may begin before the ability for receiving instruction in a direct manner exists. These impressions attach themselves to the first germs of consciousness, and on that account, the commencement of this sanctifying influence cannot be precisely determined. See De Wette's excellent remarks in the "*Studien und Kritiken*," 1839. Part iii. p. 671.

† The words in 1 Cor. vii. 14, may be taken in a twofold manner. If we understand with De Wette the *οἱ υἱοὶ* as applied to *all* Christians—(which the connection and the use of the plural render probable—) then the apostle infers that the children of Christians, although not incorporated with the church, nor yet baptized, might be called *αγία* (which is De Wette's opinion), and thus what we have remarked in the text, follows as a necessary consequence. But if we admit that Paul is speaking of the case of married persons, in which one party was a Christian, and the other a heathen, and that from the sanctification of the children of such a marriage, he infers the sanctification of the whole marriage relation—which thought perfectly suits the connection—then it would appear that Paul deduces a sanctification of the children by their connection with the parents, but not from their baptism, for the baptism of children, in these circumstances,

As to the celebration of the Holy Supper, it continued to be connected with the common meal, in which all as members of one family joined, as in the primitive Jewish church, and agreeably to its first institution. In giving a history of the Corinthian church, we shall have occasion to speak of the abuses which arose from the mixture of ancient Grecian customs with the Christian festival.

The publication of the gospel among the heathen, was destitute of those facilities for its reception, which the long-continued expectation of a Redeemer as the promised Messiah gave it among the Jews. Here was no continuous succession of witnesses forming a revelation of the living God, with which the gospel, as already indicated and foretold by the law and prophets among the Jews, might connect itself. Still the annunciation of a Redeemer found its point of connection in the universal feeling adhering to the very essence of human nature—the feeling of disunion and guilt, and as a consequence of this, though not brought out with distinctness, a longing after redemption from such a condition; and by the mental development of these nations, and their political condition at that period, sentiments of this class were more vividly felt, while the feeling of disunion (in man's own powers, and between man and God) was manifested in the prevailing tendency towards dualistic views. The youthful confidence of the old world was constantly giving way to a feeling of disunion and sadness excited by the more powerful sense of the law written on the heart, which like the external law given to the Jews, was destined to guide the Gentiles to the Saviour. The gospel could not be presented in the relation it bore to Judaism, as the completion of what already existed in the popular religion; it must come forth as the antagonist of the heathenish deification of nature, and could only

could, in many instances, be hardly performed. If an infant baptism then existed, he could not call the children of such a mixed marriage *ἐκκλησία*, in the same sense as the children of parents who were both Christians.

attach itself to the truth lying at the foundation of this enormity, the sense, namely, in the human breast of a hidden, unknown deity; it was necessary to announce Christianity as the revelation of that God in whom, by virtue of their divine original, men "lived and moved and had their being," but of whom, in consequence of their estrangement from him by sin, they had only a mysterious sense as an unknown and distant divinity. Under this aspect it might also be represented as a completion of that which was implanted by God in the original constitution of man, as the final aim of this indistinct longing. Also, in relation to all that was truly natural, belonging to the original nature of man, and not founded in sin, it might be truly asserted, that Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil. And here certainly the Gentiles were placed in a more advantageous position than the Jews; they were not exposed to the temptation of contemplating Christianity only as the completion of a religious system already in existence, and of disowning its purpose of producing an entire transformation of the life; for to a convert from heathenism, Christianity presenting itself in direct opposition to the whole of his former religious standing-point, must necessarily appear as something altogether new and designed to effect an entire revolution. Meanwhile, although Christianity must have at first presented itself as opposed to the existing elements of life in heathenism; yet Christians who continued to live in intercourse with heathens among their old connections, were so much the more exposed in a practical view to the infection of a corrupt state of morals, till their Christian life became firmly established. And although the peculiar position of the Gentiles did not expose them so much as the Jews to pervert the gospel into an *opus operatum*, and thus to misuse it as a cloak for immorality, still such an error might arise, not from the influence of Judaizing teachers, but from the depraved condition of human nature. It is evident, that Paul deemed it necessary emphatically to guard and warn them against it.*

* The *καὶ τοὺς* against which Paul warns the Ephesians (v. 6.)

Another danger of a different kind threatened Christianity when it found its way among the educated classes in the seats of Grecian learning. Since, in these places the love of knowledge predominated, and surpassed in force all the other fundamental tendencies of human nature; since men were disposed to cultivate intellectual eminence to the neglect of morals, and Christianity gave a far wider scope than heathenism to the exercise of the mental powers; since in many respects, it agreed with those among the Grecian philosophers, who rested their opposition to the popular religions on an ethical basis; the consequence was, that they made Christianity, contrary to its nature and design, chiefly an exercise of the understanding, and aimed to convert it into a philosophy, thus subordinating the practical interest to the theoretical, and obscuring the real genius of the gospel. The history of the further spread of Christianity among the heathen, and of individual churches founded among them, will give us an opportunity of developing this fact, and setting it in a clearer light. We now proceed to the second missionary journey of the apostle Paul.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

After Paul and Barnabas had spent some time with the church at Antioch, they resolved to revisit the churches founded in the course of their former missionary journey, and then to extend their labours still further. Barnabas wished to take his nephew Mark again with them as a companion, but Paul refused his assent to this proposal, for he could not excuse his having allowed attachment to home to render him unfaithful to the Lord's service, and deemed one who was not ready to sacrifice every thing to this cause as unfitted for such a vocation. We see on this occasion the severe earnest-

ness of Paul's character, which gave up, and wished others to give up, all personal considerations and feelings, where the cause of God was concerned; he never allowed himself to be tempted or seduced in this respect by his natural attachment to the nation to whom he belonged.* The indulgence shewn by Barnabas to Mark might proceed either from the peculiar mildness of his Christian character, or from a regard to the ties of relationship not yet sufficiently controlled by the power of the Christian spirit. That such human attachments had too much influence on Barnabas, is shewn by his conduct at Antioch on the occasion of the conference between Peter and Paul. Thus a sudden difference arose between two men who had hitherto laboured together in the work of the Lord, which ended in their separation from one another, and thus it was shewn, that these men of God were not free from human weakness; but the event proved that even this circumstance contributed to the extension of the kingdom of God, for, in consequence of it, the circle of their labours was very greatly enlarged. Barnabas now formed a sphere of action for himself, and first of all visited with Mark his native country Cyprus, and then most probably devoted himself to preach the gospel in other regions. For that he remained in his native country unemployed in missionary service, not only his labours up to this time forbid our supposing, but also the terms in which Paul speaks of him at a later period (1 Cor. ix. 6) as a well-known and indefatigable preacher of the gospel. Paul's severity towards his nephew was probably of service to Mark in leading him to a sense of his misconduct, for he afterwards continued faithful to his vocation. This separation was in the issue only temporary, for we afterwards find Barnabas, Paul, and Mark, in close connection with one another,

* In the *πρώτον* of Rom. i. 16, we cannot, with Rückert, find marks of this national attachment not entirely overcome. This *πρώτον* corresponds with the necessary historical development of the theocracy. The supposition is also excluded by the application of *πρώτον* in Rom. ii. 9.

although Barnabas appears always to have retained a separate independent sphere of action. In his stead Paul took Silas as his fellow-labourer.

From the beginning of his ministry, it was a fixed principle with Paul, as he himself tells us in Rom. xv. 20, and 2 Cor. x. 16, to form his own field of labour for the propagation of the gospel, and not to trespass on that of any other person; instead, therefore, of betaking himself first to Cyprus as on former occasions, he travelled through the neighbouring parts of Syria to Cilicia, Pisia, and the towns in which he had laboured on his first journey. In the town of Lystra,* he found a young

* I must here differ from the opinion I expressed in the first edition. In Acts xvi. 1, the *λαῖα*, if there are no reasons for the contrary, is mostly naturally understood of the place last mentioned, Lystra; and since the favourable testimony to his character given by the brethren at Lystra and Iconium is mentioned, we may presume, with some confidence, that one of these towns was his native place; for it is not probable that what those who knew him best said of him should be passed over, though it is barely possible that the testimony of persons living in the nearest towns to his own might be adduced. In Acts xx. 4, the approved reading is rather for than against this supposition; for if Timothy had been a native of Derbe, the predicate *Δερβινοῦ* would not have been applied to *Γαῖος* alone, but Luke would have written *Δερβινοῦ δὲ Γαῖος καὶ Τιμοθεῖος*, or *Γαῖος καὶ Τιμοθεῖος Δερβινοῖ*. But it is surprising that, in this passage, Timothy stands alone without the mention of his native place, and that in Acts xix. 29, Aristarchus and Caius are named together as Macedonians and companions of Paul. Hence it might be presumed, that the predicate *Δερβινοῦ* had been misplaced, and ought to stand after Timothy's name. Aristarchus, Secundus, and Caius, would then be named as natives of Thessalonica, and Timothy of Derbe. But if we adopt this view, then Acts xvi. 1, 2, must be differently explained. But still it is not probable that the more easy reading could be altogether removed, to make way for one more difficult. So common a name as Caius might easily belong to a Christian at Derbe and to another from Macedonia, as we find it borne also by an approved Christian residing at Corinth, Rom. xvi. 23, 1 Cor. i. 14; and Timothy's native place might be omitted because he was the best known of all Paul's associates.

man named Timothy, who, by the instructions of his mother, a pious Jewess, but married to a heathen, had received religious impressions, which had an abiding effect. His mother was converted when Paul first visited that town, and young Timothy also became a zealous confessor of the gospel. The report of his Christian zeal had spread to the neighbouring town of Iconium. In the church to which he belonged, the voices of prophets announced that he was destined to be a distinguished agent in spreading the gospel. It gratified Paul to have a zealous youth with him, who could assist him on his missionary journeys, and be trained for a preacher under his direction. He seconded the voices that thus called on Timothy, and the young man himself was prepared by his love to their common Lord, to accompany his faithful servant every where. As by his descent and education he belonged on one side to the Jews, and on the other to the Gentiles, he was so much the more fitted to be the companion of the apostles among both. And in order to bring him nearer the former, Paul caused him to be circumcised, by which he forfeited none of the publicly acknowledged rights of the Gentile Christians; for being the son of a Jewess, and educated in Judaism, he could with more propriety be claimed by the Jews.

After Paul had visited the churches already founded in this district, he proceeded to Phrygia. Of course, he could not, either on this or on a later journey, publish the gospel in all the threescore and two* towns of the populous province of Phrygia. He must have left much to be accomplished by his pupils, such, for instance, as Epaphras at Colossæ, who afterwards founded a church there, and in the towns of Hierapolis and Laodicea.†

* This is the number stated in the sixth century by Hierocles, author of the *Συναδικημος*, or a "Traveller's Companion," which gives an account of the provinces and towns of the Eastern Empire.

† I cannot agree with the opinion of Dr Schulz, brought forward in the "Studien und Kritiken," vol. ii. part 3, which is also advocated by Dr Schott in his *Isagoge*, that Paul him-

Thence he directed his course northward to Galatia. As many Jews resided in this province, he addressed

self was the founder of these churches. I cannot persuade myself that, if the Colossians and Laodiceans had received the gospel from the lips of the apostle, he would have placed them so closely in connection with those who were not personally known to him, without any distinction, as we find in Colossians ii. 1; since, in reference to the anxiety of the apostle for the churches, it always made an important difference whether he himself had founded them or not. The "*ἐκ*" would have been used too indefinitely, if its meaning had not been fixed by what preceded; from which it appears, that those churches of Phrygia are referred to, which, like the churches at Colossæ and Laodicea, had not been founded by Paul himself. And how can it be supposed that, in an epistle to a church founded by himself, he would never appeal to what they had heard from his own lips, but only to the announcement of the gospel, which they had heard from others? and that he should speak not of what he himself had seen and heard among them, but only of what had been reported to him by others respecting their state. The acute remarks of Wiggers, in the "Studien und Kritiken," 1838, part i. p. 171, have not induced me to alter my opinion on this point. The explanation he gives of the words in Coloss. ii. 1, "*also* for those (among the Christians in Colossæ and Laodicea) who have not known me personally," appears to me not so natural as the common one, which I follow. If Paul had intended to say this, he would hardly have failed to limit *ἐκ* by adding *ὑμῶν*. If the *καὶ* in verse 7 is also to be retained, yet I do not find any intimation conveyed by it that they had received instruction from another teacher, but only a reference to what preceded, that they had received from Epaphras the same gospel of the divine grace which had been published throughout the world. But, from external evidence, I cannot help considering the *καὶ* as suspicious;—the frequent repetition of it in the preceding part, and the observable reference to v. 6, might easily occasion the insertion of such a *καὶ*. But if the *καὶ* is spurious, it appears much more clearly that Epaphras, not Paul, was the teacher of this church. He is called (*ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διακονῶν*) a servant of Christ in Paul's stead, because Paul had given over to him the office of proclaiming the gospel in the three cities of Phrygia which he himself could not visit. It is not clear to me that Paul, in ii. 5, may not have used the word *ἀπαιεῖς* to denote his bodily absence in opposition to his spiritual presence among

himself probably first to these, and to the Proselytes who worshipped with them in the synagogues. But the ill-treatment he met with among the Jews, prepared an opening for him to the Gentiles, by whom he was received with great affection.

Paul had to maintain a severe conflict with bodily suffering, as appears from many allusions in his epistles, where he speaks of his being given up to a sense of human weakness. Nor is this surprising, for as a Pharisee, striving after the righteousness of the law, he had certainly not spared his own body. After he had found salvation by faith in the Redeemer, and had attained the freedom of the evangelical spirit, he was, it is true, very far from a tormenting castigation of his body, and from legal dependence on works; he expresses the most decided opposition to every thing of the kind, in language which exhibits him to us as independent of all outward circumstances, with a spirit that freely subordinated and appropriated all that was external to an infinitely higher object. Such are those memorable words which testify such consciousness of true freedom: "I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound every where and in all things, I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me," Philipp. iv. 12-13. But his new vocation allowed him still less to spare himself, since he

them, although he did not mean that he had been once among them, and was now removed to a distance from them. It still appears to me remarkable, that—if he wrote some years after his presence among them—there should be no allusion to his personal intercourse with them, especially in an epistle to a church which was in so critical a state; to whom it was so important to evince his love and care for them, and to exhort faithfully to keep the instructions they had received from him; and especially, if he had the opportunity of commending Epaphras to them, as the person who had carried on the work which he had begun, he would so much the more have stated explicitly, that Epaphras taught no other doctrine, that what they had at first received from himself, that he would only raise the superstructure on the foundation laid by himself.

laboured hard with his own hands for a livelihood, while he exerted his powers both of mind and body to the utmost in his apostolic ministry; he had so many dangers to undergo, so many hardships and sufferings to endure, under which a weak body might soon sink. Yet with the sense of human weakness, the consciousness waxed stronger of a might surpassing every thing that human power could effect, a divine all-conquering energy which proved its efficiency in the preaching of the gospel and in him as its instrument; and he could perfectly distinguish this divine power from all merely human endowments. Under a sense of human weakness, he became raised above himself, by that inward glory which beamed upon him in those communications of a higher world with which he was honoured. He considered a peculiarly oppressive pain which constantly attended him, and checked the soaring of his exalted spirit, as an admonition to humility given him by God, as a counterpoise to those moments of inward glorification which were vouchsafed him. And he informs us, that after he had prayed thrice to the Lord, to free him from this oppressive pain—an answer by a divine voice—either in vision or in pure inward consciousness—was granted him—that he must not desire to be freed from that which deepened the sense of his human weakness, but must be satisfied with the consciousness of the divine grace imparted to him; for the power of God proved itself to be truly such, even in the midst of human weakness.*

* I cannot agree with those who think that Paul, in 2 Cor. xii. 7, where he alludes to something that constantly tormented him like a piercing thorn which a person carries about in his body, only intended to signify his numerous opponents. Certainly we cannot be justified in saying, that Paul meant nothing else than what he mentions in the 10th verse; for in this latter passage, he only applies the general truth—which the divine voice had assured him of in reference to the particular object before mentioned—to every thing which might contribute to render him sensible of his human weakness. This application of the principle, and the peculiar phraseology of Paul, lead us to suppose that he meant to indicate something quite peculiar in the first passage. We

He experienced the truth of this especially during his ministry in Galatia. His body was bowed down through debility, but the divine power of his words and works so strikingly contrasted with the feebleness of the material organ, made a powerful impression on susceptible dispositions. Under these circumstances, the glowing zeal of self-sacrificing love which amidst his own sufferings enabled him to bear every thing so joyfully for the salvation of others, must have attracted the hearts of his hearers with so much greater force, and excited that ardent attachment to his person which he so vividly describes in Gal. iv. 14. "Ye received me as an angel of God, even as Jesus Christ."

The Galatian churches were formed of a stock of native Jews, and partly of a great number of Proselytes, for whom Judaism had become the transition-point to Christianity, and of persons who passed immediately from heathenism to Christianity; and with the Gentile portion of the church, some Jews connected themselves who were distinguished from the great mass of their unbelieving countrymen by their susceptibility for the gospel. But by means of those who were formerly proselytes and the Jewish Christians in the churches, an intercourse with the Jews was kept up, and hence arose those disturbances in these churches of which we shall presently speak.

On leaving Galatia, Paul was at first uncertain in what direction to turn, since new fields of labour opened to him on different sides. At one time, he thought of going in a south-westerly direction, to Proconsular Asia, and afterwards of passing in a northerly direction to Mysia and Bithynia; but either by an inward voice or a vision he received a monition from the Divine Spirit, which caused him to abandon both these plans. Having

cannot indeed suppose that he would pray to be delivered from such sufferings as were essentially and indissolubly connected with his vocation. But we must conclude that his prayers referred to something altogether personal, which affected him not as an apostle, but as Paul; though it would be absurd, in the total absence of all distinguishing marks, to attempt to determine exactly *what* it was.

formed an intention of passing over to Europe, but waiting to see whether he should be withheld or encouraged by a higher guidance, he betook himself to Troas; and a nocturnal vision, in which a Macedonian appeared calling in behalf of his nation for his aid, confirmed his resolution to visit Macedonia. At Troas, he met with Luke the physician, perhaps one of the Proselytes, who had been converted by him at Antioch, and who joined his band of companions in missionary labour. His medical skill would be serviceable on many occasions for promoting the publication of the gospel among the heathen.* The first Macedonian city in which they stayed was Philippi, a place of some importance. The number of Jews here was not sufficient to enable them to establish a synagogue. Probably there were only Proselytes, who had a place for assembling surrounded with trees, on the outside of the city near the banks of the Strymon, where they performed their devotions and the necessary lustrations, a so-called *πρὸς τὸν ποταμὸν*.† If addresses founded on passages in the Old Testament were not delivered here as in the Jewish synagogue, and if Paul could not avail himself of such a custom for publishing the gospel; still the Proselytes (especially females) assembled here on the Sabbath for prayer, and he would here meet those persons who were in a state of the greatest preparation and susceptibility for what he wished to communicate. Accordingly, early on the morning on the Sabbath, he resorted thither with his companions, in order to hold a

* We infer that Luke joined Paul at Troas, from his beginning, in Acts xvi. 10, to write his narrative in the first person—"We endeavoured to go," &c.

† The expression in Acts xvi 13, *ὅπου ἱερῶντο*, makes it probable that this *πρὸς τὸν ποταμὸν* was not a building, but only an enclosed place in the open air, which was usually applied to this purpose: compare Tertullian, *ad Nationes*, i. 13, "The *Orationes Literales* of the Jews," and *De Jejuniis*, c. 16, where he speaks of the widely-spread interest taken by the heathen in the Jewish feasts: "Judaicum certe jejunium ubique celebratur; quum omissis templis per omne libes quocunque in aperto aliquando jam preces ad cœlum mittunt."

conversation on religious topics with the women of the city who were here assembled for prayer. His words made an impression on the heart of Lydia, a dealer in purple from the town of Thyatira in Lydia. At the conclusion of the service, she and her whole family were baptized by him, and compelled him by her importunity to take up his abode with his companions in her house.* As in this town there were few or no Jews, the adherents of Judaism consisted only of proselytes; thus Christianity met in this quarter with no obstinate resistance; and it would have probably gained a still greater number of adherents, without incurring the risk of persecution, if opposition had not been excited, owing to the injury done to the pecuniary interests of certain individuals among the Gentiles, by the operation of the divine doctrine.

There was a female slave who, in a state resembling the phenomena of somnambulism, was accustomed to answer unconsciously, questions proposed to her, and was esteemed to be a prophetess inspired by Apollo;† as in all the forms of heathenish idolatry, the hidden powers of nature were taken into the service of religion.‡ This

* I can by no means admit, with some expositors of the Acts, that all this took place before the beginning of the public exercises of devotion, and that on the same day, as they were returning from the place where Paul baptized Lydia, the meeting with this prophetess occurred on their way to the Proseuche. Luke's narrative in Acts xvi. 16, does not indicate that all these events took place on one day. The assertions of the prophetess make it probable that she had often heard Paul speak.

† On the common notion of the people, that the Pythian Apollo took possession of such *ἰγναρρεμίδους* or *πιδναί*, and spoke through their mouth, see Plutarch, *De Def. Oraculor.* c. 9. Tertullian describes such persons, *Apologet.* c. 23, *qui de Deo pati existimantur, qui anhelando* (in a state of convulsive agony, in which the person felt himself powerfully impelled as by a strange spirit with a hollow voice) *profantur*.

‡ Thus the oracles of the ancients, the incubations, and similar phenomena in the heathenism of the Society Isles in the South Sea. The Priest of Oro, the God of Udar, uttered

slave had probably frequent opportunities of hearing Paul, and his words had left an impression on her heart. In her convulsive fits, these impressions were revived, and mingling what she had heard from Paul with her own heathenish notions, she frequently followed the preachers when on their way to the Proseuche, exclaiming, "These men are the servants of the Most High God, who shew unto us the way of salvation." This testimony of a prophetess so admired by the people, might have availed much to draw their attention to the new doctrine; but it was very foreign from Paul's disposition to employ or endure such a mixture of truth and falsehood. At first, he did not concern himself about the exclamations of the slave. But as she persisted, he at last turned to her, and commanded the spirit which held her rational and moral powers in bondage, to come out of her. If this was not a personal evil spirit, still it was the predominance of an ungodlike spirit. That which constitutes man a free agent, and which ought to rule over the tendencies and powers of his nature, was here held in subjection to them.* And by the

oracles in an ecstatic state of violent convulsions, and, after his conversion to Christianity, could not again put himself in such a state. See, on this subject, the late interesting accounts of this mission by Ellis, Bennett, &c.

* We have no certain marks which will enable us to determine in what light Paul viewed the phenomenon. It might be (though we cannot decide with certainty) that he gave to the heathen notion, that the spirit of Apollo animated this person, a Jewish form, that an evil spirit or demon possessed her. In this case, he followed the universally received notion, without reflecting at the moment any further upon it, for this subject belonging to the higher philosophy of nature, was far from his thoughts. He directed his attention only to the moral grounds of the phenomenon. I am convinced, that the Spirit of truth who was promised to him as an apostle, guided him in this instance to the knowledge of all the truth which Christ appeared on earth to announce, to a knowledge of every thing essential to the doctrine of salvation. By this Spirit he discerned the predominance of the reign of evil in this phenomenon; and if an invisible power is here thought to be operating, yet what is natural in the

divine power of that Saviour who had restored peace and harmony to the distracted souls of demoniacs, this woman was also rescued from the power of such an ungodlike spirit, and could never again be brought into that state. When, therefore, the slave could no longer practise her arts of soothsaying, her masters saw themselves deprived of the gains which they had hitherto obtained from this source. Enraged, they seized Paul and Silas, and accused them before the civil authorities, the *Duumvirs*,* as turbulent Jews, who were attempting to introduce Jewish religious practices into the Roman colony, which was contrary to the Roman laws, though the right was guaranteed to the Jews of practising their national cultus for themselves without molestation. After they had been publicly scourged without further examination, they were cast into prison. The feeling of public ignominy and of bodily

causes and symptoms, is not thereby excluded, even as the natural does not exclude the supernatural. Compare the admirable remarks of my friend Twisten in the second volume of his *Dogmatik*, p. 355, and what is said on demoniacs in my "*Leben Jesu*." This spirit gave Paul the confident belief, that as Christ had conquered and rendered powerless the kingdom of evil—therefore by his divine power every thing which belonged to this kingdom would henceforth be overcome. In this faith, he spoke full of divine confidence, and his word took effect in proportion to his faith. But in the words of Christ, and the declarations of the apostle respecting himself, I find no ground for admitting, that with this light of his Christian consciousness, an error could by no possibility exist, which did not affect the truths of the gospel, but belonged to a different and lower department of knowledge; such as the question, whether we are to consider this as a phenomenon explicable from the nature of the human soul, its natural powers and connection with a bodily organization, or an effect of a possession by a personal evil spirit.

* The name *στρατηγοι* which is used in the Acts to designate these magistrates, was anciently employed in the smaller Greek cities to designate the supreme authorities. See Aristoteles Politic. vii. 8, ed Bekker. Vol. ii. p. 1322, *αἱ μικραὶ πόλεις μία πρὶς πάντων (ἀρχὴν) καλοῦσι δὲ στρατηγούς καὶ πολιμαρχούς.*

pain, confinement in a gloomy prison, where their feet were stretched in a painful manner, and fastened in the stocks (*nervus*),* and the expectation of the ill-treatment which might yet await them—all this could not depress their souls; on the contrary, they were rather elevated by the consciousness that they were enduring reproach and pain for the cause of Christ. About midnight they united in offering prayer and praise to God, when an earthquake shook the walls of their prison. The doors flew open, and the fetters of the prisoners were loosened. The keeper of the prison was seized with the greatest alarm, believing that the prisoners had escaped, but Paul and Silas calmed his fears. This earthquake which gave the prisoners an opportunity of recovering their liberty—their refusing to avail themselves of this opportunity—their serenity and confidence under so many sufferings—all combined to make them appear in the eyes of the astonished jailor as beings of a higher order. He fell at their feet, and calling to mind what he had heard from the lips of Paul and Silas respecting the way of salvation announced by them, addressed them in similar language, and inquired what he must do to be saved. His whole family assembled to hear the answer, and it was a joyful morning for all. Whether the Dumvirs had become more favourably disposed by what they had learnt in the mean time respecting the prisoners, or that the jailor's report had made an impression upon them, they authorized him to say that Paul and Silas might depart. Had any thing enthusiastic mingled with that blessed inspiration which enabled Paul to endure all shame and all suffering for the cause of the Lord,—he certainly would have done nothing in order to escape disgrace, though it might have been without injury and to the advantage of his calling,—or to obtain an apology to which his civil privileges entitled him, for the unmerited treatment he had received. How far were his sentiments from what in later times the morals

* Tertullian ad Martyres, c. 2. Nihil crux sentit in nervo, quum animus in cælo est.

of monkery have called humility! -Appealing to his civil rights,* he obliged the Duumvirs, who were not justified in treating a Roman citizen† so ignominiously, to come to the prison, and, as an attestation of his innocence, with their own lips to release‡ him and his companions. They now betook themselves to the house of Lydia, where the other Christians of the city were assembled, and spoke the last words of encouragement and exhortation. They then quitted the place, but Luke and Timothy, who had not been included in the persecution, stayed behind in peace.¶ Paul left in Philippi a church full of faith and zeal—who shortly after gave a proof of their affectionate concern for him by sending contributions for his maintenance, though he never sought for such gifts, but supported himself by the labour of his own hands.

Paul and Silas now directed their course to Thessalonica, about twenty miles distant, the largest city of Macedonia, and a place of considerable traffic, where many Jews resided. Here they found a synagogue, which for three weeks Paul visited on the Sabbath; the hearts of many proselytes were won by his preaching; and through them a way was opened for publishing the

* See the well-known words of Cicero, *Act. II. in Verrem V. 57*. Jam illa vox et imploratio civis Romanus sum, quæ sæpe multis in ultimis terris opem inter barbaros et salutem attulit.

† How Paul's father obtained the Roman citizenship we know not. We have no ground for assuming, that Paul was indebted for it to his being born at Tarsus; for though Dio Chrysostom, in his second *λογος Ταρσινος*, vol. ii. ed. Reiske, p. 36, mentions several privileges which the Emperor Augustus had granted to the city of Tarsus as a reward for its fidelity in the civil wars, yet it does not appear that Roman citizenship was one of them, and allowing it to have been so, it may be doubted whether it would have been conferred on a foreign Jewish family, to which Paul belonged.

‡ Silas also must have obtained by some means the right of a Roman citizen.

¶ Timothy rejoined Paul at Thessalonica or Beræa; and Luke at a later period.

gospel among the heathen in the city. From what Paul says in 1 Thessalonians (i. 9, 10; ii. 10, 11),* we find that he was not satisfied with addressing the proselytes only once a-week at the meetings of the synagogue; his preaching would then have been confined to the small number of Gentiles who belonged to the proselytes. At the meetings of the synagogue, he could adopt only such a method and form of address, as suited the standing-point of the Jews; he must have presupposed many things, and many topics he could not develop, which required to be fully investigated, in order to meet the peculiar exigencies of the heathen. But he knew, as we see from several examples, how to distinguish the different standing-points and wants of the Jews and Gentiles; and hence, we may presume, that he carefully availed himself of opportunities to make use of these differences. The Gentiles, whose attention was awakened by the proselytes, soon assembled in various places to hear him, and from them chiefly a church was formed, professing faith in the one living God, as well as faith in the Redeemer.

Agreeably to the declarations of Christ (Matthew x. 10, compared with 1 Cor. ix. 14), Paul recognised the justice of the requirement, that the maintenance of the preachers of the gospel should be furnished by those for whom they expended their whole strength and activity, in order to confer upon them the highest benefit. But since he was conscious that in one point he was inferior to the other apostles, not having at first joined himself voluntarily to the Redeemer, but having been by the divine grace, as it were against his will, transformed from a violent persecutor of the church into an

* Schrader in his chronological remarks, p. 95, thinks that these passages cannot possibly refer to Paul's first visit to Thessalonica, which must have been a very short one. But there seems nothing improbable in the supposition, that a man of such zeal and indefatigable activity in his calling, would in the space of three or four weeks, effect so much, and leave behind him so vivid an impression of his character and conduct, as is implied in these passages.

apostle, he thought it his duty to sacrifice a right belonging to the apostolic office, in order to evince his readiness and delight in the calling which was laid upon him by a higher necessity; (1 Cor. x. 16-18). Thus also he found the means of promoting his apostolic labours among the heathen; for a ministry so manifestly disinterested, sacrificing every thing for the good of others, and undergoing all toils and deprivations, must have won the confidence of many, even of those who otherwise were disposed to suspect selfish motives in a zeal for the best interests of others, which they could not appreciate. He must have been more anxious to remove every pretext for such a suspicion, because the conduct of many Jews who were active in making proselytes, was calculated to cast such an imputation on the Jewish teachers in general. The other apostles in their youth, had earned their livelihood by a regular employment, but yet one which they could not follow in every place; Paul on the other hand, though destined to be a Jewish theologian, yet according to the maxims prevalent in the Jewish schools,* along with the study of the law, had learned the art of tent-making; and easily gained a maintenance by this handicraft, wherever he went, on account of the mode of travelling in the East, and the manifold occasions on which tents† were used.

* In the Pirke Avoth, c. 2, § 2, יָפָה תִּלְמוֹד תּוֹרָה עִם, יִרְדֶּה אֶרֶץ,

“Beautiful is the study of the law with an earthly employment, by which a man gains his livelihood;” and the reason alleged is, that both together are preventives of sin, but in their absence, the soul is easily ruined, and sin finds entrance. And thus in monasteries, occupation with manual labour had for its object, not simply to make provision for the support of the body, but also to prevent sensuality from mingling with higher spiritual employments.

† Philo de victimis, 836, ed. Francof. ἀγῶν δὲ αἰ τριχίαι, αἱ δὲ δερμαὶ συνυφανόμεναι τε καὶ σὺν ἑκάρπτεται, φερεται γυμνασίου δδωπατοῖς αἰσίου καὶ μαλίστα τοῖς ἐν στρατίαις. This tends to shew, though it does not prove, that Paul chose this occupation from its being one for which his native country was celebrated; hence, too, we read of *tentoria Cilicina*.

While anxiety for the spiritual wants of the heathen and the new converts to Christianity wholly occupied his mind, he was forced to employ the night in earning the necessaries of life for himself and his companions (1 Thess. ii. 9; Acts xx. 34), excepting as far as he obtained some relief by the affectionate voluntary offerings of the church at Philippi. But to him it was happiness to give to others without receiving any thing in return from them; from his own experience, he knew the truth of the Lord's words, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Acts xx. 35.

The apostle not only publicly addressed the church, but visited individuals in their families, and impressed on their hearts the fundamental truths of the gospel in private conversations, or warned them of the dangers that threatened the Christian life.* He endeavoured to cherish the hopes of believers under the sufferings of their earthly life, by pointing them to the period when Christ would come again to bring his kingdom among mankind to a victorious consummation. This period, for those who were conscious of having obtained redemption, was fitted to be not an object of dread, but of joyful, longing hope. And during the first part of his apostolic course, this decisive event appeared to Paul nearer than it really was. For, in this respect, the times and seasons must remain hidden till the epoch of their fulfilment, as Christ himself declared. Matthew xxiv. 36.† The first publishers of the gospel were far from thinking, that the kingdom of Christ would gradually, after a tedious process, by its own inward energy, and the guid-

* We do not see why the exhortations and warnings given to the Christians at Thessalonica, to which Paul appeals in both his Epistles, might not have been communicated during his first residence among them; for would not Paul's wisdom and knowledge of human nature, foresee the dangers likely to arise, and endeavour to fortify his disciples against them? Schrader's argument deduced from this circumstance, against the dates commonly offered to these two Epistles, does not appear very weighty.

† See *Leben Jesu*, p. 557, 612, 3d ed.

ance of the Lord in the natural developments of events, overcome the opposing powers of the earth, and make them subserve its interests. Although Christ, by the parables in which he represented the progress of his kingdom on earth, had indicated the slowness of its development, as in the parables of the grain of corn, of leaven, of the wheat and the tares; yet the meaning of these representations, as far as they were prophetic, and related to the scale of temporal development, could only be rightly understood, when explained by the cause of events. And herein we recognise the divine intuition of Christ, which could pierce through the longest succession of generations and ages. But the apostles to whom such an intuition was not granted, thought indeed that, as their Lord had promised, the gospel would spread among all the nations of the earth, by its divine energy pervading and overcoming the world; but they also believed, that the persecutions of the ruling powers among the Gentiles, would continually become more intense, till the Saviour by his divine power should achieve the triumph of the church over all opposing forces. And their enthusiasm for the cause of the gospel, the knowledge of its divine all-subsiding power, and its rapid propagation in the first age of the church, all contributed to conceal from their human vision, the obstacles which withstood the verification of their Lord's promise; nor could they even estimate correctly the population of the globe at that period.* Hence it may be explained, how Paul,—notwithstanding his apostolic character and his call to be an instrument for publishing divine truth in unsullied purity—could embrace this issue of all the hopes, the personal indissoluble union with that Saviour whom he once persecuted, and now so ardently loved, with an enthusiastic longing that outstripped the tedious development of history. In this state of mind, he was impelled to exert all his powers, in order to hasten

* These considerations must be taken into account, when we find Paul declaring in the latter period of his ministry, that the gospel was published among all the nations of the earth.

the dissemination of the gospel among all nations. It was natural, that the expectation of the speedy return of Christ should operate most vigorously in the first period of his ministry, while he was yet glowing with youthful inspiration. And thus under the sufferings and shame which he endured at Philippi, the anticipation of this divine triumph inspired him so much the more ; for it resulted from the very nature of the divine power of faith, that the confidence and liveliness of his hope increased with the conflicts he was called to endure. Filled with these sentiments, he came to Thessalonica, and with an elevation of feeling, which naturally communicated itself to other minds, he testified of the hope that animated him, and raised him above all earthly sufferings. But as his inspiration was far removed from every mixture of that fanaticism, which cannot separate the subjective feeling and mental views, from what belongs to faith and the confidence of faith,—he by no means spoke of the nearness of that great event as absolutely determined ; he adhered with modest sobriety to the saying of the Lord, that “ it was not for men to know the times and seasons.” And with apostolic discretion, he endeavoured to warn the new converts lest, by filling their imaginations with visions of the felicity of the approaching reign of Christ, and wrapping themselves in pleasing dreams, they should forget the necessary preparations for the future, and for the impending conflict. He foretold them that they had still many sufferings and many struggles to endure, before they could attain the undisturbed enjoyment of blessedness in the kingdom of Christ.

Though the apostle, in opposition to the pretensions of meritorious works and moral self-sufficiency advanced by Judaising teachers, earnestly set forth the doctrine of justification, not by human works which are ever defective, but by appropriating the grace of redemption through faith alone ; yet he also deemed it of importance to warn the new converts against another misapprehension to which a superficial conversion, or a confusion of the common Jewish notions of faith with the

Pauline, might expose them; namely, the false representation of those who held that a renunciation of idolatry, and the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, without the life-transforming influence of such a conviction, was sufficient to place them on a better footing than the heathen, and to secure them from the divine judgments that threatened the heathen world.* He often charged them most impressively, to manifest in the habitual tenor of their lives the change effected in their hearts by the gospel; and that their criminality would be aggravated, if, after they had been devoted to God by redemption and baptism to serve him with a holy life, they returned to their former vices, and thus defiled their bodies and souls which had been made the temples of the Holy Spirit. 1 Thess. iv. 6; ii. 12.

But the speedy and cordial reception which the gospel met with among the Gentiles, roused the fanatical fury and zealotry of many Jews, who had already been exasperated by the apostle's discourse in the synagogue. They stirred up some of the common people who forced their way into the house of Jason a Christian, where Paul was staying. But as they did not find the apostle, they dragged Jason and some other Christians before the judgment-seat. As on this occasion the persecution originated with the Jews, who merely employed the Gentiles as their tools, the accusation brought against the publishers of the new doctrine were not the same as those made at Philippi; they were not charged, as in other cases, with having disturbed the Jews in the peaceful exercise of their own mode of worship as guaranteed to them by the laws. As Paul had laboured here for the most part among the Gentiles, the grounds were too

* These are the vain words, the *κενὰ λόγια*, Eph. v. 6, of which Paul thought it necessary so solemnly to warn the Gentile Christians. Hence, warning them against such a superficial Christianity, he reminds them that every vicious person resembles an idolater, and would be equally excluded from the kingdom of God—that not merely for idolatry, but for every unsubdued vice, unbelievers would be exposed to the divine condemnation.

slight for supporting such an accusation, especially as the civil authorities were not predisposed to receive it. At this time, a political accusation, the *crimen majestatis*, was likely to be more successful, a device that was often employed in a similar way, at a later period, by the enemies of the Christian faith. Paul had spoken much at Thessalonica of the approaching kingdom of Christ, to which believers already belonged; and by distorting his expressions, the accusation was rendered plausible. He instigated people (it was averred) to acknowledge one Jesus as supreme ruler instead of Cæsar. But the authorities, when they saw the persons before them who were charged with being implicated in the conspiracy, could not credit such an accusation; and after Jason and his friends had given security that there should be no violation of the public peace, and that those persons who had been the alleged causes of this disturbance should soon leave the city, they were dismissed.

On the evening of the same day, Paul and Silas left the city, after a residence of three or four weeks. As Paul could not remain there as long as the necessities of the newly formed Church required, his anxiety was awakened on its behalf, since he foresaw that it would have to endure much persecution from the Gentiles at the instigation of the Jews. He had formed, therefore, the intention of returning thither as soon as the first storm of the popular fury had subsided; 1 Thess ii. 18. Possibly he left Timothy behind, who had not been an object of persecution, unless he met him first at Beræa, after leaving Philippi. Paul and Silas now proceeded to Beræa, a town about ten miles distant, where they met with a better reception from the Jews; the gospel here found acceptance also with the Gentiles; but a tumult raised by Jews from Thessalonica forced Paul to leave the place almost immediately. Accompanied by some believers from Beræa, he then directed his course to Athens.*

* It is doubtful whether Paul went by land or by sea to Athens, the *εἰ*, in Acts xvii. 14, may be understood simply

Though the consequences which resulted from the apostle's labours at Athens were at first inconsiderable ; yet his appearance in this city (which in a different sense from Rome might be called the metropolis of the world), was in real importance unquestionably one of the most memorable signs of the new spiritual creation. A herald of that divine doctrine which fought with divine power, was destined to change the principles and practices of the ancient world, Paul came to Athens, the parent of Grecian culture and philosophy ; the city to which, as the Grecian element had imbued the culture of the West, the whole Roman world was indebted for its mental advancement, which also was the central point of the Grecian religion, where an enthusiastic attachment to all that belonged to ancient Hellas, not excepting its idolatry, retained a firm hold till the fourth century. Zeal for the honour of the gods, each one of whom had here his temple and his altars, and was celebrated by the master-pieces of art, rendered Athens famous throughout the civilized world.* It was at first Paul's intention to wait for the arrival of Silas and Timothy before he en-

as marking the direction of his route. See Winer's *Grammatik*, 3d edition, p. 498. [4th ed. p. 559.] *Beræa* lay near the sea, and this was the shortest. But the *ἄς* may also signify, that they took at first their course towards the sea, in order to mislead the Jews (who expected them to come that way, and were lying in wait for Paul in the neighbourhood of the port), and afterwards pursued their journey by land. So we find on another occasion, when Paul was about to sail from Corinth to Asia Minor, he found himself in danger from the plots of the Jews, and preferred going by land ; Acts xx. 3. The first interpretation appears to be the simplest and most favoured by the phraseology. The *ἰός* adopted by Lachmann [and Tischendorf. Lips. 1841] appears to have arisen from a gloss.

* Apollonius of Tyana (in Philostratus) calls the Athenians *φιλοθεῶται*. Pausanias ascribes to them (Attic. i. 17), *τοὶ εἰς θεοὺς ἑστειβῶν ἄλλων πλῆτες*; and (c. 24), *τοὶ περισσεύοντες τῆς εἰς τὰ θεῖα σπουδῆς*. In the religious system of the Athenians, there was a peculiar refinement of moral sentiment, for they alone among the Greeks erected an altar to Pity, *ἰλός*, as a divinity.

tered on the publication of the gospel, as by his companions who had returned to Berea, he had sent word for them to follow him as soon as possible. But when he saw himself surrounded by the statues, and altars, and temples of the gods, and works of art, by which the honour due to the living God alone was transferred to creatures of the imagination—he could not withstand the impulse of holy zeal, to testify of Him who called erring men to repentance and offered them salvation. He spoke in the synagogue to the Jews and Proselytes, but did not wait as in other cities till a way was opened by their means for publishing the gospel to the heathen. From ancient times it was customary at Athens for people to meet together under covered porticoes in public places, to converse with one another on matters of all kinds, trifling or important; and then, as in the time of Demosthenes, groups of persons might be met with in the market, collected together merely to hear of something new.* Accordingly, Paul made it his business to enter into conversation with the passers-by, in hopes of turning their attention to the most important concern of man. The sentiments with which he was inspired had nothing in common with the enthusiasm of the fanatic, who is unable to transport himself from his own peculiar state of feeling to the standing-point of others, in order to make himself acquainted with the obstacles that oppose their reception of what he holds as truth with absolute certainty. Paul knew, indeed, as he himself says, that the preaching of the crucified Saviour must appear to the wise men of the world as foolishness, until they became fools, that is, until they were convinced of the insufficiency of their wisdom in reference to the knowledge of divine things, and for the satisfaction of their religious wants; 1 Cor. i. 23; iii. 18. But he was not ashamed, as he also affirms, to testify to the wise and to the unwise, to the Greeks and to the barbarians, of what he

* As Demosthenes reproaches them in his oration against the epistle of Philip; ἡμῶς δὲ οὐδὲν πικρύντες ἐνθάδε καθήμεθα καὶ τυνδανόμεθα κατὰ τὴν ἑθνην, ἢ τι λεγόμεν νικῶμεν; Acts xvii. 21.

knew from his own experience to be the power of God to save those that believe; Rom. i. 16. The market to which he resorted was near a portico of the philosophers. Here he met with philosophers of the Epicurean and Stoic schools. If we reflect upon the relative position of the Stoics to the Epicureans, that the *former* acknowledged something divine as the animating principle in the universe and in human nature, that they were inspired with an ideal model founded in the moral nature of man, and that they recognised man's religious wants and the traditions that bore testimony to it;—while on the other hand, the *latter*, though they did not absolutely do away with the belief in the gods, reduced it to something inert, non-essential, and superfluous; that they represented pleasure as the highest aim of human pursuit, and that they were accustomed to ridicule the existing religions as the offspring of human weakness and the spectral creations of fear;—we might from such a contrast infer that the Stoics made a much nearer approach to Christianity than the Epicureans. But it does not follow that the former would give a more favourable reception to the gospel than the latter, for their vain notion of moral self-sufficiency was diametrically opposed to a doctrine which inculcated repentance, forgiveness of sins, grace, and justification by faith. This supreme God—the impersonal eternal reason pervading the universe—was something very different from the living God, the heavenly Father full of love whom the gospel reveals, and who must have appeared to the Stoics as far too human a being; and both parties agreed in the Grecian pride of philosophy, which would look down on a doctrine appearing in a Jewish garb, and not developed in a philosophic form, as a mere outlandish superstition. Yet many among those who gathered round the apostle during his conversations, were at least pleased to hear something new; and their curiosity was excited to hear of the strange divinity whom he wished to introduce, and to be informed respecting his new doctrine. They took him to the hill, where the first tribunal at Athens, the Areopagus, was accustomed to hold its sittings, and where he could

easily find a spot suited to a large audience.* The discourse of Paul on this occasion is an admirable specimen of his apostolic wisdom and eloquence : we here perceive how the apostle (to use his own language) to the heathens, became a heathen that he might gain the heathens to Christianity.

Inspired by feelings that were implanted from his youth in the mind of a pious Jew, and glowing with zeal for the honour of his God, Paul must have been horror-struck at the spectacle of the idolatry that met him wherever he turned his eyes. He might easily have been betrayed by his feelings into intemperate language. And it evinced no ordinary self-denial and self-command, that instead of beginning with expressions of detestation, instead of representing the whole religious system of the Greeks as a Satanic delusion, he appealed to the truth which lay at its basis, while he sought to awaken in his hearers the consciousness of God which was oppressed by the power of sin, and thus aimed at leading them to the knowledge of that Saviour whom he came to announce. As among the Jews, in whom the knowledge of God formed by divine revelation led to a clear and pure development of the idea of the Messiah, he could appeal to the national history, the law and the prophets, as witnesses of Christ ; so here he appealed to the undeniable anxiety of natural religion after an unknown God. He began with acknowledging in the religious zeal of the Athenians a true religious feeling, though erroneously directed, an undeniable tending of the mind towards something divine.† He begins with acknow-

* The whole course of the proceedings and the apostle's discourse prove that he did not appear as an accused person before his judges, in order to defend himself against the charge of introducing *religiones peregrinæ et illicitæ*. The Athenians did not view the subject in so serious a light.

† Much depends on the meaning attached to the ambiguous word *θεοφοβία*, Acts xvii. 22. The original signification of this word, in popular usage, certainly denoted something good—as is the case in all language with words which denote the fear of God or of the gods—the feeling of dependence on a higher power, which, if we analyse the reli-

ledging in a laudatory manner the strength of the religious sentiment among the Athenians,* and adducing as a

religious sentiment, appears to be its prime element; although not exhausting every thing which belongs to the essential nature of theism, and although this first germ, without the addition of another element, may give rise to superstition as well as faith. Now since, where the feeling of fear (*δύλακτος το δαίμονος*, *Theophrast.*) is the ruling principle in the conscience, superstition alone can be the result, it has happened that this word has been, by an abuse of the term, applied to that perversion of religious sentiment. This phraseology was then prevalent. Thus Plutarch uses the word in his admirable treatise *περί δις δαιμονίας και αδιότητος*, in which he proceeds on the supposition, that the source of superstition is that mode of thinking which contemplates the gods only as objects of fear; but he errs in this point, that he traces the origin of this morbid tendency to a wrong direction of the intellectual faculties. Compare the profound remarks of Nitzsch, in his treatise on the religious ideas of the ancients. The word *δυσδαιμονία* occurs in the New Testament only in one other passage, Acts xxv. 19, where the Roman procurator Festus, speaking to the Jewish King Agrippa of Judaism, could not intend to brand it as superstition, but rather used the word as a general designation for a foreign religion. He might, however, choose this word, although not with a special design, yet not quite accidentally, as one which was suited to express the subjective view taken by the Romans of Judaism. But Paul certainly used the word in a good sense, for he deduced the seeking after the unknown God, which he doubtless considered as something good, from this *δυσδαιμονία*, so prevalent among the Athenians. He announced himself as one who would guide their *δυσδαιμονία*, not rightly conscious of its object and aim, to a state of clear self-consciousness by a revelation of the object to which it thus ignorantly tended. Still it may be asked, whether Paul had not still stronger reasons (though without perhaps reflecting deeply upon them) for using the word *δυσδαιμονία*, instead of another which he was accustomed to use as the designation of pure piety. He uses the term *εὐσεβείαν* immediately afterwards, where it plainly indicates the exercise of the religious sentiment towards the true God.

* In the comparative *δυσδαιμονιστίους*, a reference is made to the quality which, as we have before remarked, used to be attributed to the Athenians in a higher degree than to all the other Greeks,—a fact which the apostle would easily have learned.

proof of it, that while walking amongst their sacred edifices, he lighted on an altar dedicated to an unknown God.*

The inscription certainly as understood by those who framed it, by no means proved that they were animated with the conception of an unknown God exalted above all other Gods; but only that according to their belief they had received good or evil from some unknown God,

* If we examine with care all the accounts of antiquity, and compare the various phases of polytheism, we shall find no sufficient ground to deny the existence of such an altar as is here mentioned by Paul. The inscription, as he cites it, and which proves his fidelity in the citation, by no means asserts that it was an altar to *the* Unknown God, but only an altar dedicated to *an* unknown God. Jerome, it is true, in the first chapter of his Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to Titus, and in his *Epistola ad Magnum*, thus cites the inscription of the altar—*Diis Asiae et Europae et Libyae, Diis ignotis et peregrinis*; and he thinks that Paul modified the form of the inscription to suit his application of it. But Jerome, perhaps here as in other instances, judged too superficially. Several ancient writers mention the altars of the unknown gods at Athens, but in a manner that does not determine the form of the inscription. For example; Pausanias, *Attic.* i. 4, and *Eliac.* v. 14, βωμὸς Διῶν ὀνομαζομένοις ἀγνώστον; Apollonius of Tyana, in Philostratus, vi. 3, where, like Paul, he finds, in the style of the inscription, an evidence of the pious disposition of the Athenians in reference to divine things, that they had erected altars even to unknown gods; εὐφροσύνην τε περὶ πάντων Διῶν εὖ λήγειν, καὶ ταῦτα Ἀθηναίων, οὗ καὶ ἀγνώστον λαμβάνει βωμὸς ἰδρυόμεναι. Isodorus of Pelusium, vi. 69, cannot be adduced as an authority, since he merely speaks of conjectures. Diogenes Laertius, in the life of Epimenedes III., that, in the time of a plague, when they knew not what God to propitiate in order to avert it, that he caused black and white sheep to be let loose from the Areopagus, and wherever they laid down to be offered to the respective divinities (τῷ προσέκειντο Διῷ). Hence, says Diogenes, there are still many altars in Athens without any determinate names. Although the precise inscriptions is not here given, yet altars might be erected on this or a similar occasion which were dedicated to an unknown god, since they knew not what god was offended and required to be propitiated, as Chrysostom has also remarked in his 38th homily on the Acts.

and this uncertainty in reference to the completeness of their worship, enters into the very essence of Polytheism, since, according to its nature, it includes an infinity of objects. But Paul cited this inscription, in order to attach a deeper meaning to it, and to make it a point of connection, for the purpose of pointing out a higher but indistinct sentiment, lying at the root of Polytheism. Polytheism proceeds from the feeling of dependence—(whether founded on a sense of benefits conferred or of evils inflicted)—on a higher unknown power, to which it is needful that man should place himself in the right relation; but instead of following this feeling, in order by means of that in human nature, which is supernatural and bears an affinity to God, to rise to a consciousness of a God exalted above nature, he refers it only to the powers of nature operating upon him through the senses. That by which his religious feeling is immediately attracted, and to which it refers itself, without the reflective consciousness of man making it a distinct object, is one thing; but that which the mind enthralled in the circle of nature—doing homage to the power over which it ought to rule—converts with reflective consciousness into an object of worship, is another thing. Hence Paul views the whole religion of the Athenians as the worship of a God unknown to themselves, and presents himself as a person who is ready to lead them to a clear self-consciousness respecting the object of their deeply felt religious sentiment.

“I announce to you Him,” said he, “whom ye worship, without knowing it.* He is the God who created

* We see from this how Paul psychologically explains the origin of polytheism, or the deification of Nature; how far he was from adopting the Jewish notion of a supernatural magical origination of idolatry by means of evil spirits, who sought to become the objects of religious homage. The idea contained in these words of Paul forms also the groundwork of his discourse at Lystra. We may also find a reference to it in what he says, Rom. i. 19, of an original knowledge of God, suppressed by the predominance of immoral propensities; and Rom. i. 21, 25, that idolatry begins when religious

the world and all that is therein. He, the Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made by human hands; he requires no human service on his own account—he, the all-sufficient one, has given to all, life, and breath, and all things. He also is the originator of the whole human race, and conducts its development to one great end. He has caused all the nations of the earth to descend from one man,* and has not allowed them to spread by chance over the globe; for, in this respect, every thing is under his control, he has appointed to each people its dwelling-place, and has ordained the various eras in the history of nations—their development in space and time is fixed by his all-governing wisdom.† Thus God has revealed himself in the vicissitudes of nations, in order that men may be induced to seek after

sentiment cleaves to the creature, instead of rising above nature to the Creator. On the first passage, see Tholuck's, and on the second Rückert's, excellent remarks.

* This also is probably connected with what he says in opposition to polytheistic views. On the polytheistic standing-point, a knowledge of the unity of human nature is wanting, because it is closely connected with a knowledge of the unity of God. Polytheism prefers the idea of distinct races over whom their respective gods preside, to the idea of one race proceeding from one origin. As the idea of one God is divided into a multiplicity of gods, so the idea of one human race is divided into the multiplicity of national character, over each of which a god is supposed to preside, corresponding to the particular nation. On the other hand, the idea of one human race, and their descent from one man, is connected with the idea of one God. Thus Paul sets the unity of the theistic conceptions in contrast with the multiplicity existing in the deification of nature. The Emperor Julian observed this contrast between the polytheistic and monotheistic anthropology and anthropogony. See *Julian, Fragmentum ed. Spanheim*, t. i. 295. πανταχοῦ ἄθροον νοσαντων θιόν, οἱ πλείους προῆλθον ἀνθρώποι, τοῖς γυνεαρχαῖς θιοῖς ἀποκλήρωσινται.

† A peculiar relation of the parts of the earth inhabited by the several nations to their peculiar character, as this is formed by native tendencies and moral freedom; the secret connection between nature and mankind ordained by God, and grounded in a higher law of spiritual development.

him—to try whether they could know and find him; and they might easily know him, since he is not far from any one of us, for in him our whole existence has its root.”* As an evidence of the consciousness of this original relationship to God, he quotes the words of a heathen, one of themselves, the poet Aratus, who came from the native country of the apostle. “For we are the offspring of God.”† After this appeal to the universal higher

* The apostle's words are—“*ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἵσμεν.*” Many expositors have so explained these words, as if they were intended to denote the continual dependence of existence on God, as the preserver of all things; and excepting that *ἐν* is taken in a Hebraistic sense = *through*, we might so understand the words in the pure Greek idiom, for *εἶναι ἐν τινι* may signify to depend wholly on some one, as *ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ἵσμεν*, in the *Œdipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles, v. 314. But this explanation does not suit the connection of the passage; for Paul evidently is speaking here, not of what men have in common with other creatures, but of what distinguishes men from other creatures, that by which they are especially related to God; for as an evidence of this, “in him we live, and move, and are,” he quotes the words of Aratus, which refer precisely to this relation of man to God. Hence, in order to find the connection according to this explanation, we must amplify the thought too artificially; thus, “We are distinguished above all other creatures in our capacity for knowing this dependence on God.” On the other hand, every thing is connected in the most natural manner, if we consider these words, “in him we live, move, and are,” as pointing out the secret connection of men with God as “the Father of Spirits,” in virtue of their spiritual and moral nature. As Paul says nothing here which is peculiar to the Christian system, but expresses a fact grounded on the general principles of theism, we may with great propriety compare it with a perfectly analogous expression of *Deo Chrysostom*, which serves to confirm this explanation. He says of men—“*ἀπεὶ οὐ μακρὰν εὐδ' ἔχω τοῦ Θεοῦ διωκισμένοι, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ μὲν πνεύματος ἐκείνου . . . , πανταχόθεν ὑποπιπταμένοι τῆς Θεῆς φύσεως.*”—*De Dei Cognitione*, vol. i. ed. Reiske, p. 384.

† These words are quoted from the *φαινόμεναι* of Aratus, v. 5, but they are also to be found in the beautiful hymn of the stoic Cleanthus, where they are used as an expression of Reason, as a mark of this divine relationship: “*ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γίνεσθαι ἵμεν ἡνὶ μίμημα λαχόντες μούνοι.*” A similar sentiment occurs in the golden verses: “*Θεῶν γὰρ γένος ἐσθ' ἡμετέροιον.*”

self-consciousness, he goes on to say ; since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to believe that the divinity is like any earthly material, or any image of human art. This negative assertion manifestly includes a positive one ; we must strive to rise to the divinity by means of that within us which is related to him. Instead of carrying on the argument against idolatry, the apostle leaves his hearers to decide for themselves—and presupposing the consciousness of sin—without attempting to develope it—he proceeds with the annunciation of the gospel. After God had with great long-suffering endured the times of ignorance,* he now revealed the truth to all men, and required all to acknowledge it and repent. With this was connected the annunciation of the Redeemer, of the forgiveness of sins to be obtained through him, of his resurrection as the confirmation of his doctrine, and a pledge of the resurrection of believers to a blessed life, as well as of the judgment to be passed by him on mankind.† As long as the apostle confined himself to the general doctrine of Theism, he was heard with attention by those who had been used to the lessons of Grecian philosophy. But when he touched upon that doctrine which most decidedly marked the opposition of the Christian view of the world to that entertained by the heathens,‡ when he spoke of a general resurrection,

* Paul here gives us to understand, that not merely negative unbelief in reference to truth not known, but only criminal unbelief of the gospel offered to men, would be an object of the divine judgment. This agrees with what he says in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, that Heathens as well as Jews would be judged according to the measure of the law known to them; and with what he says in Rom. iii. 25, of the *παρεσις τῶν προηγουμένων ἀμαρτημάτων*.

† It is very evident from the form of the expressions in Acts xvii. 31, as well as from verse 32, where the mention of the general resurrection in Paul's speech is implied, that, in the Acts, we have only the substance given of what he said.

‡ This is expressed in the words of the heathen Octavius, in Minucius Felix, c. xi. : *Cœlo et astris, quæ sic relinquimus ut invenimus, interitum denuntiare, sibi mortuis, extinctis, qui sicut nascimur et interimus, æternitatem repromit-*

he was interrupted with ridicule on the part of some of his hearers. Others said, we would hear thee speak at another time on this matter; whether they only intended to hint in a courteous manner to the apostle that they wished him to close his address, or really expressed a serious intention of hearing him again.* There were only a few individuals who joined themselves to the apostle, listened to his further instructions, and became believers. Among these was a member of the Areopagite council, Dionysius; who became the subject of so many legends. The only authentic tradition respecting him appears to be, that he was the principal instrument of forming a church at Athens, and became its overseer.†

While Paul was at Athens, Timothy returned from Macedonia,‡ but the anxiety of Paul for the new church

tere. The doctrine of the Stoics, of an *αναστηχινσις*, the regeneration of the universe in a new form after its destruction, has no affinity to the doctrine of the resurrection, but is strictly in accordance with the pantheistical views of the Stoics.

* From the silence of the Acts, we are not to infer with certainty that Paul never addressed these persons again.

† See the account of the Bishop Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius, in his Eccles. Hist. iv. 23.

‡ On this point there is much uncertainty. According to the Acts, Silas and Timothy first rejoined Paul at Corinth. But 1 Thess. iii. 1 seems to imply the contrary. This passage may indeed be thus understood,—that Paul sent Timothy, before his departure for Athens, to the church in Thessalonica, although he knew that he should now be left in Athens without any companions, for he wished to leave Silas in Berea. If he came from Berea alone, he would rather have said, *ερχισθαι εις Αθηναις μόνον*. But this he could not say, since he did not depart to Athens alone, but with other companions. Still the most natural interpretation of the passage is, that Paul, in order to obtain information respecting the Thessalonians, preferred being left alone in Athens, and sent Timothy from that city. Also, in the Acts, xvii. 16, it is implied that he waited at Athens for the return of Silas and Timothy; for though the words *ἐν ταῖς Αθηναῖς* may be referred, not to *ἐνδεχόμενον*, but to the whole clause, still we cannot understand the passage otherwise. If we had merely the account in the Acts, we should be led to

at Thessalonica, induced him to send his young fellow-labourer thither, that he might contribute to the establish-

the conclusion, by a comparison of the xvii. 16, and xviii. 5, that Silas and Timothy were prevented from meeting with Paul at Athens, and they first found him again in Corinth, as he had given them notice that he intended to go thither from Athens. But by comparing it with what Paul himself says, 1 Thess. iii. 1, we must either rectify or fill up the account in the Acts. We learn from it that Timothy at least met with Paul at Athens, but that he thought it necessary to send him from thence to Thessalonica, and that he did not wait for his return from that city to Athens, which may be easily explained. But Luke, perhaps, had not so accurate a knowledge of all the particulars in this period of Paul's history; he had perhaps learned only that Paul met again at Corinth with Timothy and Silas, and hence he inferred, as he knew nothing of the sending away of Timothy in the mean time from Athens to Thessalonica, that Paul, after he had parted from his two companions at Berea, rejoined them first at Corinth. As to Silas, it is possible that, on account of the information he brought with him, he was sent back by Paul with a special commission from Athens to Berea, or, what is more probable, that he had occasion to stay longer than Timothy at Berea, and hence could not meet him at Athens. It might also be the case that Luke erroneously concluded,—since Silas and Timothy both first met Paul again at Corinth, that he left both at Berea,—it would be possible that he left only Silas behind and brought Timothy with himself to Athens. It favours, though it does not establish this opinion, that Paul, in 1 Thess. iii. 1, alleges as the reason for sending away Timothy, not the unpleasant news brought by Timothy from Macedonia, but the hindrances intervening, which rendered it impossible for him to visit the church in Thessalonica according to his intention. Schneckenburger, in his learned essay on the date of the Epistles to the Thessalonians (in the *Studien der Evangelischen Geistlichkeit Württemberg*, vol. vii. part 1, 1834, p. 139), (with which in many points I am happy to agree), maintains that Paul might have charged his two companions to follow him quickly from Berea, because he intended soon to leave Athens, where he expected no suitable soil for his missionary labours. But we have no sufficient reason for supposing this. Paul found at Athens a synagogue for the first scene of his ministry as in other cities; he felt himself compelled, as he says, to publish the gospel to Greeks and to Barbarians; he knew it was the

ment of their faith and their consolation under their manifold sufferings; for Timothy had communicated to him many distressing accounts of the persecutions which had befallen this church.

He travelled alone from Athens, and now visited a place most important for the propagation of the gospel, the city of Corinth, the metropolis of the province of Achaia. This city, within a century and a half after its destruction by Julius Cæsar, once more became the centre of intercourse and traffic to the eastern and western parts of the Roman Empire, for which it was fitted by its natural advantages, namely, by its two noted ports, that of *Korynæus* towards Lesser Asia, and that of *Aschæus* towards Italy. Being thus situated, Corinth became an important position for spreading the gospel in a great part of the Roman Empire, and hence Paul chose this city, as he had chosen others similarly situated, to be the place where he made a long sojourn. But Christianity had here also, at its first promulgation, peculiar difficulties to combat, and the same causes which counteracted its reception at first, threatened at a later period, when it had found entrance, to corrupt its purity, both in doctrine and practice. The two opposite mental tendencies, which at that time especially

power of God, which would conquer the philosophical blindness of the Greeks as well as the ceremonial blindness of the Jews, though he well knew that on both sides the obstacles were great. At all events, by some not improbable combinations, the narrative in the Acts and the expressions of Paul may easily be reconciled, and we are not therefore justified with Schrader in referring the passage in 1 Thess. iii. 1, to a later residence of Paul at Athens. All the circumstances mentioned seem best to agree with the period of his first visit. Paul having been obliged, contrary to his intention, to leave Thessalonica early, wished on several occasions to have revisited it; his anxiety for the new church there was so great, and in his tender concern for it, he showed the great sacrifice he was ready to make for it, by saying that he was willing to remain alone at Athens. In later-times, when there was a small Christian church at Athens, this would not have been so great a sacrifice.

opposed the spread of Christianity, were, on the one side, an intense devotedness to speculation and the exercise of the intellect, to the neglect of all objects of practical interest, which threatened to stifle altogether the religious nature of men, that tendency which Paul designates by the phrase, "*seeking after wisdom*;"—and, on the other side, the sensuous tendency mingling itself with the actings of the religious sentiment; the carnal mind which would degrade the divine into an object of sensuous experience; that tendency to which Paul applies the phrase, "*seeking after a sign*." The first of these tendencies predominated among the greater number of those persons in Corinth, who made pretensions to mental cultivation, for new Corinth was distinguished from the old city, chiefly by becoming, in addition to its commercial celebrity, a seat of literature and philosophy, so that a certain tincture of high mental culture pervaded the city.* The second of these tendencies was found among the numerous Jews, who were spread through this place of commerce, and entertained the common sensuous conceptions respecting the Messiah. And finally, the spread and efficiency of Christianity was opposed by that gross corruption of morals, which then prevailed in all the great cities of the Roman Empire, but especially in Corinth was promoted by the worship of Aphrodite, to which a far-famed temple was here erected, and thus consecrated the indulgence of sensuality, favoured as it was by the incitements constantly presented in a place of immense wealth and commerce.†

The efficiency of Paul's ministry at Corinth, was

* In the 2d century, the rhetorician Aristides says of this city: σοφοι δι' ἧ καὶ κατ' ἰδὼν ἂν εὖρος καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀψυχῶν μαθούσιν ἂν καὶ ἀπουσίας τοσούτοι θεσκαυτοὶ γραμματικῶν περὶ πάντων αὐτῆς, ὅποι καὶ μόνον ἀποβλέψῃς τις, καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἰδοὺς αὐτὰς καὶ τὰς σπουάς. ἴσιν τὰ γυμνασία, τὰ διδασκαλεῖα, καὶ μαθήματα τε καὶ ἱστορήματα. Aristid. in Neptunum. ed Dindorf, vol. i. p. 40.

† The rhetorician Dio Chrysostom says to the Corinthians: πολλοὶ οἰκίστη τῶν εὐσῶν τε καὶ γυμνημάτων ἱπαφροδιτοτατην. Orat. 37, vol. ii. p. 119, ed. Reiske.

doubtless much promoted by his meeting with a friend and zealous advocate of the gospel, at whose house he lodged, and with whom he obtained employment for his livelihood, the Jew Aquila from Pontus, who probably had a large manufactory in the same trade by which Paul supported himself. Aquila does not appear to have had a fixed residence at Rome, but to have taken up his abode, at different times, as his business might require, in various large cities situated in the centre of commerce, where he found himself equally at home. But at this time, he was forced to leave Rome against his will, by a mandate of the Emperor Claudius, who found in the restless, turbulent spirit of a number of Jews resident at Rome (the greater part freed-men*), a reason or a pretext for banishing all Jews from that city.†

* There was a particular quarter on the other side the Tiber inhabited by Jews. See *Philo legat ad Cajum*, § 23. *ἐν τῇ πρὸς τοῦ Τιβερίου ποταμοῦ μεγάλῃ τῇ Ῥώμης ἀποστῆναι κατὰ χρομένην καὶ οἰκουμένην πρὸς Ἰουδαίους.*

† The account of Suetonius in the Life of Claudius, c. 25. "*Judeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulsi*," is of little service in historical investigations. If Suetonius, about fifty years after the event itself, mixed up what he had heard in a confused manner of Christ, as a promoter of sedition among the Jews, with the accounts of the frequent tumults excited among them, by expectations of the Messiah,—we are not justified in concluding, that this banishment of the Jews had any real connection with Christianity. Dr Baur, in his essay on the object and occasion of the Epistle to the Romans, in the "*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*," 1836, part iii. p. 110, thinks, that the disputes between the Jews and Christians in Rome, occasioned the disturbances which at last brought on the expulsion of both parties, and that this is the fact which forms the basis of the account. But disputes among the Jews themselves, whether Jesus was to be acknowledged as the Messiah, would certainly be treated with contempt by the Roman authorities, as mere Jewish religious controversies. See Acts xviii, 15. And if Christians of Gentile descent, who did not observe the Mosaic law, were then living at Rome, these, as a *genus tertium*, would not be confounded with the Jews, and a decree of banishment directed against the Jews would not affect them. They only became subject to punishment by the laws

If Aquila was at that time a Christian, which will easily account for his speedy connection with Paul, this decree of banishment certainly did not affect him as a Christian, but as classed with the other Jews, in virtue of his Jewish descent, and his participation in all the Jewish religious observances. But if the gospel had already been propagated among the Gentiles at Rome, (which is not probable, for this took place at a later period, by means of Paul's disciples, after his sphere of action had been much extended), the Gentile Christians, who received the gospel free from Jewish observances, and had not yet attracted notice as a particular sect, would not have been affected by a persecution, which was directed against the Jews, as Jews, on purely political grounds.

We cannot answer with certainty the questions, whether Aquila, on his arrival at Corinth, was already a Christian; for it cannot be determined merely from the silence of the Acts, that he was not converted by Paul. In any case, his intercourse with the apostle had great influence in the formation of his Christian views. Aquila appears from this time as a zealous preacher of the gospel, and his various journeys and changes of residence, furnished him with many opportunities for acting in this capacity. His wife Priscilla also distinguished herself by her active zeal for the cause of the gospel, so that

against the *religiones peregrinas et novas*. We can only suppose a reference to political disturbances among the Jews, or to occurrences which might excite suspicions of this kind. And this account is of little service in fixing the chronology of the apostolic history, for Suetonius gives no chronological mark. Such a mark would be given, if we connect the banishment of the Jews with the *senatus consultum*, "*de mathematicis Italia pellendis*," for here Tacitus (Annal. xii. 52), gives the date Fausto Sulla, Salvio Othone Coss. = A. D. 52. But the chronological connection of these two events is very uncertain, as they proceeded from different causes. The banishment of the astrologers, proceeded from suspicions of conspiracies against the life of the Emperor, with which the banishment of the Jews stood in no sort of connection, although it might have its foundation in the dread of political commo-

Paul calls them both in Rom. xvi. 3, his "*helpers in Christ Jesus.*"

We must suppose that the reception given in general at Athens to the publication of the gospel, must have left a depressing effect on the mind of the apostle, as far as he was not raised above all depressing considerations by a conviction of the victorious divine power of the gospel. Hence, he himself says, that on his arrival at Corinth, he was at the utmost removed from attaching any importance to any thing that human means, human eloquence, and human wisdom, could furnish towards procuring an entrance for the publication of the divine word: that he came and taught among them with a deep sense of his human weakness—with fear and trembling as far as his own power was concerned; but at the same time, with so much greater confidence in the power of God working through his instrumentality. He had experienced at Athens, that it availed him nothing to become a Greek to the Greeks, in his mode of exhibiting divine truths, where the heart was not open to his preaching, by a sense of spiritual wants. At Corinth, he was satisfied with the simple annunciation of the Redeemer, who died for the salvation of sinful men, without adapting himself, as at Athens, to the taste of the educated classes in his style of address. The greater part indeed of the persons with whom he came in contact at Corinth, were not, as at Athens, people of cultivated minds, but belonging to the lower class, who were destitute of all refinement; for even when Christianity had spread more widely among the higher classes, he could still say, that not many distinguished by human culture or rank were to be found among the Christians, but God had chosen such as were despised by the world, in order to exemplify in them the power of the gospel, 1 Cor. i. 26. Among these people of the lower class, were those who hitherto had been given up to the lusts that prevailed in this sink of moral corruption, but who, by the preaching of the apostle, were awakened to repentance, and experienced in their hearts the power of the announcement of the divine forgiveness of sins;

1 Cor. vi. 11. Paul could indeed appeal to the miracles by which his apostleship had been attested among the Corinthians, 2 Cor. xii. 12; but yet these appeals to the senses were not the means by which the gospel chiefly effected its triumphs at Corinth. As the gospel necessarily appeared as foolishness to the wisdom-seeking Greeks, as long as they persisted in their conceit of wisdom, so also to the sign-seeking Jews, as long as they persisted in their carnal mind, unsusceptible of the spiritual operations of what was divine, and required miracles cognizable by the senses, the gospel which announced no Messiah performing wonders in the manner their carnal conceptions had anticipated, would always be a stumbling-block. That demonstration which Paul made use of at Corinth, was the same which in all ages has been its firmest support, and without which all other evidences and means of promoting it will be in vain, the "*demonstration of the Spirit and of power*," 1 Cor. ii. 4; the mode in which the gospel operates, by its indwelling divine power, on minds rendered susceptible of it, in consequence of the feeling of their moral necessities; the demonstration arising from the power with which the gospel operates on the principle in human nature, which is allied to God, but depressed by the principle of sin. Thus the sign-seeking Jews who attained to faith, found in the gospel a "power of God" superior to all external miracles, and the believers among the wisdom-seeking Greeks, found a divine wisdom, compared with which all the wisdom of their philosophers appeared as nothing.

As was usual, Paul was obliged by the hostile disposition with which the greater part of the Jews received his preaching in the synagogue, to direct his labours to the Gentiles through the medium of the Proselytes, and the new church was mostly formed of Gentiles, to whom a small number of Jews joined themselves. That he might devote all his time and strength without distraction to preaching, he soon organized the small company of believers into a regular church, and left the baptism of those who were brought to the faith by his preaching, to

be administered by those who were chosen to fill the offices in the Church; 1 Cor. i. 16; xvi. 15.

In the mean time, the acceptance which the gospel here found among the heathen, powerfully excited the rage of the Jews, and they availed themselves of the arrival of the new Proconsul Annæus Gallio, a brother of Seneca the philosopher, to arraign Paul before his tribunal. Since, by the laws of the empire, the right was secured to them of practising their own religious institution, without molestation, they inferred, that whoever caused division among them by the propagations of doctrines opposed to their own principles, encroached on the enjoyment of their privileges, and was amenable to punishment. But the Proconsul, a man of mild disposition,* shewed no desire to involve himself in the internal religious controversies of the Jews, which must have appeared to a Roman statesman as idle disputes about words; and the Gentiles themselves, on this occasion, testified their disapprobation of the accusers. The frustration of this attempt against the apostle enabled him to continue his labours with less annoyance in this region, so that their influence was felt through the whole province of Achaia, (1 Thess. i. 8; 2 Cor. i. 1), whether he made use of his disciples as instruments, or suspended his residence at Corinth, by a journey into other parts of the province, and then returned again to the principal scene of his ministry.†

When he had been labouring for some time in these parts, Timothy returned from Thessalonica, by whom he received accounts of the state of the church there, which were far from pleasing in every respect. The faith of the church had indeed been steadfast under its persecu-

* Known by the name of the *dulcis Gallio*. Seneca Praefat. natural. quest. iv. Nemo mortalium uni tam dulcis est, quam hic omnibus.

† See 2 Thess. i. 4, where Paul, in an epistle written during the latter part of his residence at Corinth, says, that in several churches, and therefore not merely in the Corinthian, he had spoken with praise of the faith and zeal of the Thessalonian church.

tions, and their example and zeal had promoted the farther spread of the gospel in Macedonia, even to Achaia, but many had not been preserved pure from the corruption of heathen immorality. The expectation of Christ's reappearance had taken in the minds of many an enthusiastic direction, so that they neglected their stated employments, and expected to be maintained at the expense of their more opulent brethren. Prophets rose up in their assemblies, whose addresses contained much that was enthusiastic; while others, who were on their guard against these enthusiastic exhibitions, went so far in an opposite direction as to put in the same class the manifestations of a genuine inspiration. Probably from a dread of enthusiasm, they could not endure that any person who felt himself inwardly called, should give free utterance to his sentiments in the meetings of the church, for to this Paul's exhortation appears to refer, in 1 Thess. v. 19, "Quench not the Spirit." On all these accounts, he considered it necessary to address an epistle of encouragement and exhortation to this church.*

* In this epistle, he evidently assumes, that the manner of his coming from Philippi to Thessalonica, was still fresh in the remembrance of the church, so that he alludes to only one residence among them, after his arrival from Philippi. What Paul says in 1 Thes. i. 9, he could only say at a period which was shortly subsequent to his departure from Thessalonica. Hence, it is certain, that the epistle was written at that juncture, and that it is the first among the Pauline epistles which have reached us, an opinion, with which its whole complexion well agrees. The reasons against this view, maintained by Schrader, some of which we have mentioned and endeavoured to refute, are not convincing. The anxiety of many persons in reference to their deceased friends (iv. 13,) proves indeed, that some of the first Christians at Thessalonica were already dead, but certainly does not justify the conclusion, that this church must have already existed a long time; for within a comparatively short time, many, especially those who were in years or in declining health at their conversion, might have died. Also the argument, that Paul, in this epistle, supposes the existence of a church organized in the usual manner with Presbyters, will prove nothing against the early composition of this epistle. For

In his epistle, he reminds the church of the manner in which he conducted himself among them, the example of manual industry which he set, and the exhortations which he imparted to them. He calmed their anxiety respecting the fate of those who had died during this period. He warned against making attempts to determine the second coming of Christ. That critical moment would come unexpectedly; the exact time could be ascertained by no one; but it was the duty of Christians to be always prepared for it. They were not to walk in darkness, lest that day should overtake them as a thief in the night; as children of the light, they ought to walk continually in the light and the day; and to watch over themselves, that they might meet the appearance of the Lord with confidence.

After a time, Paul learnt that the epistle had not attained its end; that the enthusiastic tendency in the Thes-

why should not Paul have accomplished all this during his short stay at Thessalonica, or put matters in a train for its being done soon after his departure? It is evident, from Acts xiv. 23, how important he deemed it to give the usual constitution to the churches as soon as they were formed; and this must have been more especially the case with a church which he left in such critical circumstances, even apart from persecutors. Indeed, if the rule laid down in the First Epistle to Timothy, that no novice in Christianity should be chosen to the office of presbyter, had been from the beginning an invariable principle, we might conclude, that so new a church, which must consist entirely of novices, could have no presbytery. But there is nothing to support this conclusion, and the circumstances of the primitive apostolic age are against it. The rules given in that epistle, as well as many other points, tend to prove that it was written in the latter part of Paul's life, and in reference to a church not newly organized. And what we find in Philip. iv. 6, by no means obliges us to assume a second visit of Paul to Thessalonica, after which both epistles were written. He there says, that during the time of the first publication of the gospel among the heathen, (which cannot be referred to a later period), when he left Macedonia, no church excepting that at Philippi, had sent him a contribution—first at Thessalonica before he left Macedonia, and then once or twice at Corinth, during his longer sojourn there. 2 Cor. xi. 9.

salonian church had continued to increase. In his former epistle, he had considered it necessary to guard them against both extremes; to warn them against the entire suppression of free prophetic addresses, as well as against receiving every thing as divine which pretended to be so, without examination. The higher life was to be developed and expressed freely without harassing restrictions; but all claims to inspiration ought to be submitted to sober examination.* He must, therefore, have had cause to suspect danger from this quarter, even had he not received more exact information. But he was subsequently informed, that persons had come forward in the church who professed to have received revelations to the effect that the appearance of the Lord was close at hand. They also endeavoured to strengthen their assertions by distorting certain expressions of the apostle, which he had used during his residence at Thessalonica. But now since the epistle of Paul was so plainly opposed to the enthusiastic tendency which aimed at fixing the exact time of Christ's second coming; one of the promoters of this error ventured so far as to forge another epistle in Paul's name, which might serve to confirm this expectation, in which probably he took advantage of the circumstance, that the apostle in his first epistle had satisfied himself with urging what was of practical importance without giving a decided opinion on the nearness or remoteness of that great event.† Such forgeries were

* It appears to me that 1 Thess. v. 21, altogether relates to what immediately precedes—"prove all things in the communications of the prophets, and retain whatever is good;" but in verse 22, he makes a transition to a general remark, "that they should keep themselves at a distance from every kind of evil," with which his prayer for the sanctification of the whole man naturally connects itself.

† The passage in 2 Thess. ii. 2, might be so understood, as if only the statements in the First Epistle had been misrepresented; and it is certainly possible to imagine, that they had so misapplied Paul's comparison of a thief in the night, as if he expected the appearance of Christ to be an event close at hand, and only meant to say that the point of time could not be given more distinctly. But these words

not at all uncommon in this century after the beginning of the Alexandrian period of literature, and their authors were very adroit in justifying such deceptions for the purpose of giving currency to certain principles and opinions.* This enthusiastic tendency also operated injuriously in producing idleness, and a neglect of a person's own affairs, united with a prying, intermeddling curiosity respecting the concerns of others. Paul, therefore, thought it necessary to write a second epistle to Thessalonica. † In this epistle, for the purpose of guarding them against the hasty expectation of that last decisive period, he directed their attention to the signs of the times which would precede it. The revelation of the evil that opposed itself to the kingdom of God—a self-idolatry excluding the worship of the living God—would first rise to the highest pitch. The power of the delusion, by a hypocritical show of godliness, and by extraordinary power, apparently miraculous, would deceive those who were not disposed to follow the simple, unadulterated truth. The rejection of the True and the Divine, would be punished by the power of falsehood. Those persons would be ensnared by the arts of deception, who, because they had suppressed the sense of truth in their hearts, deserved to be deceived, and by their own criminality had prepared themselves for all the deceptions of falsehood. Then would Christ appear, in order by

of Paul would naturally be understood of the forgery of a letter in his name, and the manner in which he guards against similar forgeries, by a postscript in his own hand, favours this opinion.

* The Bishop Dionysius very much lamented the falsification of letters which he had written to various churches. Euseb. iv. 23.

† He had at that time probably travelled from Corinth into Achaia, and founded other churches. Already he had sustained many conflicts with the enemies of the gospel; he had occasion to request the intercessory prayers of the churches, that he might be delivered from the machinations of evil-minded men; for such were not wanting, who were unsusceptible of receiving the gospel; 2 Thess. iii. 2. This reminds us of the accusations made by the Jews against Paul.

his victorious divine power to destroy the kingdom of evil, after it had attained its widest extension, and to consummate the kingdom of God. As signs similar to those which prognosticate the last decisive and most triumphant epoch, are repeated in all the great epochs of the kingdom of God, as it advances victoriously in conflict with the kingdom of evil, Paul might believe that he recognised in many signs of *his own* time, the commencement of the final epoch. By the light of the divine spirit, and according to the intimations of Christ* himself, he discerned the general law of the development of the kingdom of Christ, which is applicable to all the great epochs down to the very last; but he was not aware that similar phenomena must often recur until the arrival of the final crisis.†

As Paul was unexercised in writing Greek, and, amidst his numerous cares and labours, instead of writing his

* See *Leben Jesu*, pp. 558, 612.

† When persons have attempted to determine with exactness the signs of the times given by Paul, they have failed in many points. In the first place, they have sought for the appearances to which the apostle refers in later ages, while Paul refers to appearances in his own age, or to those which they seemed to forbode. In other important periods, which preceded remarkable epochs for the development of the kingdom of Christ, signs might be found similar to those which Paul has here described. Still we should not be justified in saying that these signs in this particular form were consciously present to Paul's mind. And thus we should fall into error, if we expected to find what is anti-Christian only in certain particular appearances of the Ecclesiastical History, instead of recognising in these appearances a Christian truth lying at their basis, and the same anti-Christian spirit (by which the Christian principle is here disturbed, and at last wholly obscured) likewise in other appearances. When too, these signs have been looked for in the actual situation of the apostle, the defectiveness of our knowledge of his situation, and of the appearances peculiar to his times, has been forgotten. Or, instead of estimating the great views respecting the development of the kingdom of God, which the apostle here unfolds, according to the ideas contained, the kernel has been thrown away, and the shell retained, and they have been compared with the Jewish fables respecting Antichrist.

epistles with his own hand, dictated them, as was a usual practice among the ancients, to an amanuensis, letters could be more easily forged in his name. Perhaps he had already adopted the plan of adding a few words of salutation with his own hand, in order to give the churches a special proof of his affectionate sympathy. Such an autograph addition would now be so much the more necessary for the purpose of preventing falsifications of his epistles; accordingly, in this epistle to the Thessalonians he expressly notices this circumstance, that they might in future know all the epistles that really were his own production.*

Thus Paul laboured during another half-year for the spread of Christianity in these parts, and then concluded

* From these words of Paul, 2 Thess. iii. 17, we cannot infer with Schrader, that Paul must have already written many epistles (to the Thessalonians), and, therefore, that this could not be the second; for if Paul had determined now for the first time to employ this precaution against the falsification of his epistle, he might certainly thus express himself; it was not necessary to use the future *scripsi*, and yet Paul might have written many epistles before this. For, might he not already have written epistles to the churches in Cilicia, and Syria, and others lately founded by him, as well as to individuals? We cannot certainly maintain, that the whole correspondence of the great apostle, who was so active and careful in every respect, has come down to us. Lastly, the forgery of a letter under his name was still easier when only a few, than when many of his epistles were extant. Therefore the proofs fail which are employed partly for the later origin, partly for the spuriousness of the epistle. And as to the salutation added by Paul as a mark of his handwriting, it only follows that, under the existing circumstances, he determined to add such a mark of his handwriting to all his epistles, but by no means that, under altered circumstances, he adhered to this resolution; nor could we conclude with certainty, that in all those epistles in which Paul has not expressly remarked that the salutation was penned by him, the benediction at the close was really not in his handwriting. When once that peculiar practice and his handwriting had become generally known among the churches, he might make such an addition, without expressly mentioning that it was written by himself.

the second period of his ministry among the heathen, which began with the second missionary journey. We are now arrived at a resting-place, from which we shall proceed to a new period in his ministry, and in the history of the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles.

CHAPTER VII.

THE APOSTLE PAUL'S JOURNEY TO ANTIOCH, AND HIS RE-NEWED MISSIONARY LABOURS AMONG THE HEATHEN.

AFTER Paul had laboured during another half-year for the establishment of the Christian church in Corinth and Achaia, he resolved, before attempting to form new churches among the heathen, to visit once more that city which had been hitherto the metropolis of the Christian-Gentile world, Antioch, where possibly he had arranged a meeting with other publishers of the gospel. This was no doubt the principal, but probably not the only, object of his journey. He felt it to be very important to prevent the outbreak of a division between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, and to take away from the Jews and Jewish Christians the only plausible ground for their accusation, that he was an enemy of their nation and the religion of their fathers. On this account, he resolved to revisit at the same time the metropolis of Judaism, in order publicly to express his gratitude to the God of his fathers in the temple at Jerusalem, according to a form much approved by the Jews, and thus practically to refute these imputations. There was at that time among the Jews a religious custom, arising most probably from a modification of the Nazarene vow, that those who had been visited with sickness or any other great calamity vowed, if they were restored, to bring a thank-offering to Jehovah in the Temple, to abstain from wine for thirty days, and to shave their

heads.* Paul had probably resolved, on the occasion of his deliverance from some danger during his last residence at Corinth, or on his journey from that city,† publicly to express his grateful acknowledgments in the Temple at Jerusalem. The form of his doing this was in itself a matter of indifference, and in the spirit of Christian wisdom, he felt no scruple to become in respect of form, to the Jews a Jew, or to the Gentiles a Gentile. When he was on the point of sailing with Aquila to Lesser Asia, from Cenchræa, he began the fulfilment of his vow.‡ He left his companion with his wife behind

* Josephus, de Bello Jud. ii. 15, *τοὺς γὰρ ἡ νοσφ καταπεινουμενοὺς ἢ τισὶν ἄλλαις ἀναγκαῖς ἰδοὺς εὐχεσθαι πρὸς τὸ ἡμεῶν, ὥς ἀπαλειψαίνεσθαι μέλλουσιν θύσιαι, εἴηεν τι ἀφαιρῆσθαι καὶ ξυρῆσθαι τὰς κεφαλὰς.* It appears to me quite necessary to change the aorist in the last clause into the future *ξυρῆσθαι*; and I would translate the passage thus—"they were accustomed to vow that they would refrain from wine and shave their hair thirty days before the presentation of the offering." From comparing this with the Nazarite vow, we might indeed conclude that the shaving of the hair took place at the end of thirty days, as Meyer thinks in his commentary; but the words of Josephus do not agree with this supposition, for we cannot be allowed to interpolate another period before the *ξυρῆσθαι*, "and at the end of these thirty days." Also what follows in Josephus is opposed to it, and Paul's shaving his hair several weeks before his arrival at Jerusalem, will not harmonize with such a supposition.

† From how many dangers he was rescued, and how much would be required to complete the narrative given in the Acts, we learn from 2 Cor. xi. 26, 27.

‡ Unnecessary difficulties have been raised respecting Acts xviii. 18. Paul in the 18th, and the verse immediately following, is the only subject to which every thing is referred; and the words relating to Aquila and Priscilla form only a parenthesis. All that is here expressed must therefore be referred to Paul and not to Aquila, who is mentioned only incidentally. Schneckenburger, in his work on the Acts, p. 66, finds a reason for mentioning such an unimportant circumstance respecting a subordinate person in this, that a short notice of a man, who for half a year lived in the same house as Paul, would serve as an indirect justification of the apostle against the accusations of his Judaizing oppo-

at Ephesus, whither he promised to return, and hastened to Jerusalem, where he visited the church, and presented his offering in the temple.* He then travelled to An-

nents; but this is connected with the whole hypothesis, of which, for reasons already given, I cannot approve.

Besides, Aquila could not have taken *such* a vow, because he did not travel to Jerusalem, where the offering ought to be presented. We must therefore suppose that he had made a vow of another kind, that he would not allow his hair to be cut till he had left Corinth in safety, like the Jews who bound themselves by a vow to do or not to do something till they had accomplished what they wished, as, for example, not to take food; compare Acts xxiii. 14, and the legends from the *εὐαγγέλιον καὶ Ἑβραίου*, in Jerome de v. i. c. ii. But such unmeaning folly no one can attribute to Aquila. And Luke would hardly have related any thing so insignificant of Aquila, who was not the hero of his narrative. But Meyer thinks he has found a special proof that this relates not to Paul but to Aquila; because, in Acts xviii. 18, the name of Priscilla is mentioned not as it is in v. 2 and 26, and contrary to the usage of antiquity, with a design to make the reference here designed to Aquila more pointed. We might allow some weight to this consideration, if we did not find the same arrangement of the names in Rom. xvi. 3, and 2 Tim. iv. 19. Hence we shall find a common ground of explanation for what appears a striking deviation from the customs of antiquity, that although Priscilla was not a public instructress, which would have been contrary to the laws of the church, yet she was distinguished even more than her husband for her Christian knowledge, and her zeal for the promotion of the kingdom of God; that in this respect Paul stood in a more intimate relation, a closer alliance of spirit to her, as Bleek has suggested in his Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 422. And thus we find in this undesigned departure from the prevailing usage, on a point so unimportant in itself, an indication of the higher dignity conferred so directly by Christianity on the female sex.

* The words in Acts xviii. 21, cannot prove that Paul travelled to Jerusalem, for the original expression only makes it highly probable. "I will return to you again, God willing;" and all the rest is only a gloss. If, therefore, we do not find the journey to Jerusalem indicated in the *ἀναβας* and *κατιβη* of v. 22, we must assume that Paul on this journey came only as far as Antioch, and not to Jerusalem, and then

tiach, where he stayed a long time, and met with Barnabas, and other friends and former associates in publishing the gospel. The apostle Peter also joined the company of preachers of the gospel here assembled, who beheld the apostles of the Jews, and the apostle of the Gentiles united in true Christian fellowship with one another, in accordance with the spirit of the resolutions adopted by the Council at Jerusalem.

But this beautiful unanimity was disturbed by some Judaizing zealots, who came from Jerusalem probably with an evil design, since what they had heard of the free publication of the gospel among the heathen was offensive to their contracted feelings. For a considerable time the pharisaically-minded Jewish Christians appeared to have been silenced by the apostolic decisions, but they could not be induced to give up an opposition so closely allied with a mode of thinking exclusively Jewish, against a completely free and independent gospel. The constant enlargement of Paul's sphere of labour among the heathen, of which they became more fully aware by his journeys to Jerusalem and Antioch, excited afresh their

the interpretation of Acts xviii. 18, given in the text, must be abandoned. It is also remarkable that Luke, in referring to Paul's sojourn at Jerusalem, should mention only his saluting the church, and say nothing of the presentation of his offering; and that James, who, on Paul's former visit to Jerusalem, had advised him to such a line of conduct, should not have appealed to the example given by himself of such an accommodation to the feelings of the Jews. But Luke is never to be regarded as the author of a history complete in all its parts, but simply as a writer who, without historical art, put together what he heard and saw, or what became known to him by the reports of others. Hence he narrates several less important circumstances, and passes over those which would be more important for maintaining the connection of the history. Also, to a reader familiar with Jewish customs, it might be sufficiently clear that Paul, according to what is mentioned in xviii. 18, must have brought an offering to Jerusalem. At all events, if we wish to refer v. 22 only to Cæsarea, the *ἀναβάς* must be superfluous, and the *κατάβη* would not suit the geographical relation of Cæsarea to Antioch.

suspicion and jealousy. < Though they professed to be delegates sent by James from Jerusalem,* it by no means follows that they were justified in so doing; for before this time such Judaizers had falsely assumed a similar character.> These persons were disposed not to acknowledge the uncircumcised Gentile Christians who observed no part of the Mosaic ceremonial law, as genuine Christian brethren, as brethren in the faith, endowed with privileges equal to their own in the kingdom of the Messiah. As they looked upon them as still unclean, they refused to eat with them. The same Peter who had at first asserted so emphatically the equal rights of the Gentile Christians, and afterwards at the last apostolic convention had so strenuously defended them—now allowed himself to be carried away by a regard to his countrymen, and for the moment was faithless to his principles. We here recognise the old nature of Peter, which, though conquered by the Spirit of the gospel, was still active, and on some occasions regained the ascendancy. The same Peter who, after he had borne the most impressive testimony to the Redeemer, at the sight of danger for an instant denied him. The example of an apostle whose character stood so high, influenced other Christians of Jewish descent, so that even Barnabas withdrew from holding intercourse with Gentile Christians. Paul, who condemned what was evil without respect of persons, called it an act of hypocrisy. He alone remained faithful to his principles, and in the presence of all administered a severe reprimand to Peter, and laid open the inconsistency of his conduct. “Why, if thou thyself, he said, although thou art a Jew, hast no scruple to live as a Gentile with the Gentiles, why wilt thou force the Gentiles to become Jews? *We* are born Jews—we, if the Jews are right in their pretensions, were not sinners like the Gentiles, but clean and holy as born citizens of the theocratic nation. But by our

* This is not necessarily contained in the words *οὗτοι ἀπὸ* *ἱερουσαλὴμ*, which may simply mean that these persons belonged to the church at Jerusalem, over which James presided.

own course of conduct, we express our contrary conviction. With all our observance of the law, we have acknowledged ourselves to be sinners who are in need of justification as well as others, well knowing that by works such as the law is able to produce,* no man can be justified before God; but this can only be attained by faith in Christ, and having been convinced of this, we have sought justification by him alone. But this conviction we contradict, if we seek again for justification by the works of the law. We therefore present ourselves again as sinners† needing justification, and Christ, instead of justifying us from sin, has deprived us of the only means of justification and led us into sin, if it be

* We may here notice briefly what will be more fully developed when we come to treat of the apostolic doctrine, that Paul, by *εργων νομου*, understands works which a compulsory, threatening law may force a man to perform, in the absence of a holy disposition. The idea comprehends the mere outward fulfilling of the law, in reference to what is moral as well as what is ritual. Both which are so closely connected in Judaism, maintain their real importance only as an expression of the truly pious disposition of *δικαιοσύνη*. The idea of the moral or the ritual predominates only according to the varied antithetical relation of the phrase. In this passage, a special reference is made to the ritual.

† The words, Gal. ii. 18, "If what I have destroyed (the Mosaic law) I build up again, (like Peter, who had practically testified again to the universal obligation of the Mosaic law), I must look upon myself as a transgressor of the law, as a sinner." (Paul here supposes Peter to express the conviction, that he had done wrong in departing from the law, that he was guilty of transgressing a law that was still binding). I cannot perfectly agree with Rückert's exposition, who supposes these words to be used by Paul in reference to himself. For this general proposition would not be correct, "Whoever builds up again what he has pulled down pursues a wrong course." If he had done wrong in pulling down, he would do right in building up what had been pulled down; and even the opponents of Paul maintained the first; they could not therefore be affected by that proposition, and the logical Paul would have taken good care not to express it.

sin to consider ourselves freed from the law. Far be this from us."*

If we fix this controversy of Paul and Peter,† which as the following history shews, produced no permanent

* Paul's reprimand of Peter (Gal. ii.) appears to reach only as far as the 18th verse, excl. What follows, by the transition from the plural to the singular, and by the *γὰρ*; is shewn to be a commentary by Paul on some expressions which, uttered in the warmth of feeling, might be somewhat obscure, and evidently not a continuation of his address. As to the date of this interview with Peter, we readily allow that we cannot attain to absolute certainty. Paul himself narrates the occurrence immediately after speaking of *that* journey to Jerusalem which we find reasons for considering as his *third*. And, accordingly, we suppose that this event followed the apostolic convention at Jerusalem. And probably many persons would be induced, by the report of what had taken place among the Gentile Christians, (which to Jewish Christians must have appeared so very extraordinary), to resort to the assembly of the Gentile Christians at Antioch, partly in order to be witnesses of the novel transactions, and partly out of suspicion. According to what we have before remarked, it is not impossible that these Judaizers, so soon after the resolutions for acknowledging the equal rights of Gentile Christians were passed, became unfaithful to them, because they explained them differently from their original intention. But there is greater probability, that these events did not immediately succeed the issuing of those resolutions. It is by no means evident that Paul, in this passage of the Epistle to the Galatians, intended to observe chronological exactness. He rather appears to be speaking of an event which was quite fresh in his memory, and had happened only a short time before. Besides the two suppositions here mentioned, a third is possible, which has been advocated by Hug and Sneckenburgh; namely, that this event took place *before* the apostolic convention. But though Paul here follows no strict chronological order, yet it is difficult to believe that he would not place the narrative of an event—so closely connected with the controversies which gave occasion to his conferences with the apostles at Jerusalem—at the beginning, instead of letting it follow as supplementary.

† Confessedly a mistaken reverence for the apostle led many persons in the ancient (especially the eastern) church

separation between them—exactly at this period, it will throw much light on the connection of events. Till now the pacification concluded at Jerusalem between the Jewish and Gentile Christians had been maintained inviolate. Till now Paul had to contend only with Jewish opponents, not with Judaizers in the churches of Gentile Christians;—but now the opposition between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, which the apostolic resolutions had repressed, again made its appearance. As in this capital of Gentile Christianity, which formed the central point of Christian missions, this controversy first arose, so exactly in the same spot it broke forth afresh, notwithstanding the measures taken by the apostles to settle it; and having once been renewed, it spread itself through all the churches where there was a mixture of Jews and Gentiles. Here Paul had first to combat that party whose agents afterwards persecuted him in every scene of his labours. It might at first appear strange, that this division should break out exactly at that time; at the very time when the manner in which Paul had just appeared at Jerusalem, having become to the Jews a Jew, might have served to make a favourite impression on the minds of those Christians who were still attached to Judaism. But although it might thus operate on the most moderate among them, yet the event shewed, that on the fanatical zealots, whose principles were too contrary to admit of their being reconciled to him, it produced quite an opposite effect, when they saw the man who had spoken so freely of the law—who had always so strenuously maintained the equal rank of the uncircumcised Gentile Christian with the Jewish Christians, and whom they had condemned as a despiser

to a very unnatural view of this controversy. They adopted the notion that Peter and Paul had an understanding with one another, that both, the one for the advantage of the Jews, the other for the advantage of the Gentile Christians, committed an *officiosum mendacium*, in order that no stain might rest on Peter's conduct. Augustin, in his Epistle to Jerome, and in his book *De Mendacio*, has admirably combated this prejudice, and the false interpretation founded upon it.

of the law, when they saw this man representing himself as one of the believing Jewish people. They well knew how to make use of what he had done at Jerusalem to his disadvantage; and by representing his actions in a false light, they accused him of inconsistency, and of artfully attempting to flatter the Gentile Christians.

The influence of this party soon extended itself through the churches in Galatia and Achaia. It is true that Paul, when, after leaving his friends at Antioch, he visited once more the churches in Phrygia and Galatia, on his way to Ephesus, whither he had promised to come on his return—observed no striking change among them.* But still, he remarked, that

* He expresses to the Galatian churches his astonishment, that they had deserted so soon after his departure, the evangelical doctrine for which they had before shown so much zeal; Gal. i. 6. As several modern writers (particularly Rückert) have maintained it as an ascertained fact, that Paul during his second residence among the Galatian churches, had to oppose their tendency to Judaism, we must examine more closely the grounds of this assertion. As to Gal. i. 9, I cannot acknowledge as decisive the reasons alleged by Rückert, Usteri, and Schott, against these words being an impassioned asseveration of the sentiment in the preceding verse, and in favour of their being a reference to what he had said, when last with them. Might it not be a reference to what was written before, as Eph. iii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 2? For that what he refers to, in both these passages, is rather more distant, makes no difference in the form of the expression. But if these words must refer to something said by Paul at an earlier period, yet the consequence which Rückert believes may be drawn from them, does not follow; for though Paul had no cause to be dissatisfied with the church itself, yet after what he had experienced at Antioch, added to the earlier leaning of a part of the church to Judaism, he might consider it necessary to charge it upon them most impressively, that under whatever name, however revered, another doctrine might be announced to them, than what he had preached—such doctrine would deserve no credit, but must be Antichristian. Although Gal. v. 21, certainly refers to something said by the apostle at an earlier period, yet nothing further can be concluded from it: for in every church, he must have held it very necessary to make it apparent, that men would

these Judaizing teachers sought to gain an entrance into the churches, that they made a show of great zeal for their salvation, and that the Gentiles might attain to the full enjoyment of the privileges and benefits of the Messiah's kingdom—and that they strove to imbue them with the false notion, that unless they allowed

only grossly flatter themselves if they imagined that they could enter the kingdom of heaven without a complete change of heart and conduct; 1 Thess. iv. 6; Eph. v. 5, 6. The words in Gal. v. 2, 3, must be thus understood, "As I said, that whoever allows himself to be circumcised renounces his fellowship with Christ, so I testify to such an one again, that he is bound to fulfil the whole law." Evidently, the second and third verses relate to one another; the thoughts are correlative. If Paul intended to remind the Galatians of warnings he had given them by word of mouth, why did he not insert the *καὶ* in verse 2? since what is there expressed forms the leading thought, and requires the strongest emphasis to be laid upon it. Also in the fact, that without any preparation as in his other epistles, he opens this with such vehement rebuke, I cannot with Ruckert find a proof that during his former residence among these churches, he had detected the Judaizing tendency among them, and was forced to involve all in blame, in order to bring them back to the right path. This very peculiarity in the tone with which the epistle begins may be easily explained, if we suppose that since, during his presence among them, he had perceived no departure from the doctrine announced to them—and had warned them beforehand of the artifices of the Judaizers—the sudden information of the effect produced among them by this class of persons, had more painfully surprised, more violently affected him; and the whole epistle bears the marks of such an impression on his mind. Whichever among the conflicting interpretations of the words in ch. iv. 18, may be taken, this much is evident, that Paul wished that they would act during his absence as they had done during his presence. And this he surely could not have said, if already during his former residence, they had given him such cause for dissatisfaction. It is arbitrary to refer this only to his first residence among them. Had he during that residence noticed such things among them—he would also have felt that *ἀναγκαῖον* in reference to them, he would have perceived the necessity of *ἐλλείπειν τὴν φωνήν*, and have already made use of this new mode of treatment, v. 20.

themselves to be circumcised, they could not stand on a level with the Jewish Christians. Still he had cause to be satisfied with the manner in which they maintained their Christian freedom against these persons; Gal. iv. 18. And he sought only to confirm them still more in this Christian mode of thinking and acting, while he endeavoured to impress on their hearts afresh—the lesson—that independently of any legal observance, salvation could be obtained only by faith in Christ, and earnestly put them on their guard against every thing which opposed or injured this truth. This was interpreted by his Judaizing opponents, who were wont to misrepresent all his actions and words, and in every way to infuse distrust of him, as if he had grudged the Galatians those higher privileges which they might have obtained by the reception of Judaism; Gal. iv. 16.

Paul now chose as the scene of his labours for the spread of the gospel, the centre of intercourse and traffic for a large part of Asia, the city of Ephesus, the most considerable place of commerce on this side of the Taurus. But here also was a central point of mental intercourse; so that no sooner was Christianity introduced, than it was exposed to new conflicts with foreign tendencies of the religious spirit, which either directly counteracted the new divine element, or threatened to adulterate it. Here was the seat of heathen magic, which originally proceeded from the mystic worship of Artemis,* and here also the Jewish magic, connecting itself with the heathenish, sought to find entrance. The spirit of the times, dissatisfied with all the existing religions, and eager after something new, was favourable to all such attempts.

After Paul had preached the gospel for three months in the synagogue, he was induced, by the unfriendly dis-

* In the mysterious words on her statue, higher mysteries were sought, and a special magical power ascribed to them. See *Clem. Strom.* V. 568, and after these, forms of incantation were constructed, which were supposed to possess great efficacy, the so-called *εφεσια γραμματα*.

position manifested by a part of the Jews, to turn his attention to the Gentiles, and met his hearers daily in a school belonging to one of their number, a rhetorician, named Tyrannus. It was most important that the divine power which accompanied the promulgation of the gospel should manifest itself in some striking manner, in opposition to the magic so prevalent here, which by its apparently great effects deceived and captivated many—in order to rescue men from these arts of deception, and prepare their hearts to receive the truth. And though a carnal “seeking after signs” might have tempted men (like the Goēs Simon) to cleave solely to the sensible phenomenon in which the power of the divine was manifested, and to regard Christianity itself as a new and higher kind of magic,—a most powerful counteraction against such a temptation proceeded from the genius of Christianity, when it really found an entrance into the heart. One remarkable occurrence which took place at this time, greatly contributed to set in the clearest light the opposition which Christianity presented to all such arts of jugglery. A number of Jewish Gcētæ frequented these parts, who pretended that they could expel evil spirits from possessed persons by means of incantations, fumigations, the use of certain herbs, and other arts, which they had derived from king Solomon;* and these people could at times, whether by great dexterity in deceiving the senses, or by availing themselves of certain powers of nature unknown to others, or by the influence of an excited imagination, produce apparently great effects, though none which really promoted the welfare of mankind.† When these Jewish Gcētæ beheld the effects which Paul produced by calling on the name of Jesus, they also attempted to make use of it as a magical formula for the exorcism of evil spirits. The unhappy consequences of this attempt made a powerful

* See Justin. Dial. c. Tryph. Jud. f. 311, ed. Colon.

† The cures they performed were sometimes followed by still greater evils, as Christ himself intimates would be the case; Luke xi. 23. See also *Leben Jesu*, p. 291.

impression on many, who, as it appeared, had certainly been moved by the miraculous operations of the apostle, so as to acknowledge Jesus as the author of divine powers in men, but imagined that these powers could be employed in the services of their sinful practices, and in connection with their vain magical arts. But terrified by the disaster to which we have referred, they now came to the apostle, and professed repentance for their sinful course, and declared their resolution to forsake it. Books full of magical formulæ, which amounted in value to more than "fifty pieces of silver," were brought together and publicly burnt. This triumph of the gospel over all kinds of enthusiasm and arts of deception was often repeated.

Ephesus was a noted rendezvous for men of various kinds of religious belief, who flocked hither from various parts of the east, and thus were brought under the influence of Christianity; amongst others, Paul here met with twelve disciples of John the Baptist, the individual who was commissioned by God to prepare for the appearance of the Redeemer among his nation and contemporaries; but, as was usual with the preparatory manifestations of the kingdom of God, different effects were produced according to the different susceptibility of his hearers. There were those of his disciples who, following his directions, attained to a living faith in the Redeemer, and some of whom became apostles; others only attained a very defective knowledge of the person and doctrine of Christ; others again, not imbibing the spirit of their master, held fast their former prejudices, and assumed a hostile attitude towards Christianity; probably the first germ of such an opposition appeared at this time from which the sect of the disciples of John was formed, which continued to exist in a later age. Those disciples of John with whom Paul met at Ephesus, belonged to the second of these classes. Whether they had become the disciples of John himself in Palestine and received baptism from him, or whether they had been won over to his doctrine by means of his disciples in other parts,—(which would serve to prove that John's disciples aimed at form-

ing a separate community, which necessarily would soon assume a jealous and hostile position against Christianity on its first rapid spread)—at all events, they had received the little they had heard of the person and doctrine of Jesus as the Messiah, to whom John pointed his followers, and considered themselves justified in professing to be Christians* like others. Paul believed that he should find them such; but, on further conversation with them, it appeared that they understood nothing of the power of the glorified Saviour, and of the communication of divine life through him, that they knew nothing of a Holy Spirit. Paul then imparted to them more accurate instruction on the relation between the ministry of John and that of Christ, between the baptism of John and the baptism which would initiate them into communion with Christ, and into a participation of the divine life that proceeded from him. After that, he baptized them in the name of Christ, with the usual consecration by the sign of the laying-on of hands and the accompanying prayer; and their reception into Christian fellowship was sealed by the usual manifestations of Christian inspiration.

Paul's residence at Ephesus was not only of considerable importance for the spread of Christianity throughout Asia Minor, for which object he incessantly laboured either by undertaking journeys himself, or by means of disciples whom he sent out as missionaries; but it was also a great advantage for the churches that were already formed in this region, as from this central point of intercourse he could most easily receive intelligence from all quarters, and, by means of letters or messengers, could attend to their religious and moral condition, as the necessities of the churches might require. His anxiety for these his spiritual children always accompanied him; he often reminded them that he remembered them daily in his prayers with thanksgiving and intercession; thus he assured the Co-

* The name *μαθηται*, Acts xix. 1, without any other designation, can certainly be understood only of the disciples of Jesus; and the manner in which Paul addressed them, implies, that they were considered to be Christians.

rinthians in the overflowing of his love, that he bore them continually in his heart; and vividly depicted his daily care for all the churches he had founded by his touching interrogations, "Who is weak in faith and I am not weak? Who meets with a stumbling-block and I am not disturbed even more than himself?" 2 Cor. xi. 29.

Cases of the latter kind must often have excited the grief of the apostle; for as the Christian faith gradually gained the ascendancy and affected the general tone of thinking in society, new views of life in general, and a new mode of feeling, were formed in the Gentile world; and in opposition to the immoral licentiousness of heathenism, which men were led to renounce by the new principles of the Christian life, an anxiously legal and Jewish mode of thinking, which burdened the conduct with numberless restraints, was likely to find an entrance, and must have disturbed the minds of many who had not attained settled Christian convictions.

Probably it was soon after his arrival at Ephesus that Paul received information respecting the state of the Galatian churches which awakened his fears. During his last residence among them, he had perceived the machinations of a Judaizing party, which were likely to injure the purity of the Christian faith and the freedom of the Christian spirit. He was aware of the danger which threatened from this quarter, and had taken measures to counterwork it; he was not successful, however, in averting the approaching storm, as he now experienced to his great sorrow.

The adversaries whom he had here to contend with were unwilling to acknowledge his apostolic authority, because he had not been instructed and called to the apostleship immediately by Christ himself; they maintained that all preaching of the gospel must rest on the authority of the apostles who were appointed by Christ himself; they endeavoured to detect a contrariety between the doctrine of Paul and the doctrine of the apostles, who had allowed the observance of the law in their churches, and accused him in consequence of a departure from the pure doctrine of Christ. They could

also appeal to the fact, that he represented himself when among the Jews as a Jew observing the law, and therefore, when he taught otherwise among the Gentiles, he could only do it in order to flatter them, to the injury of their true interest.

Although the anti-pauline tendency in the Galatian churches was connected with that party which had its principal seat in Palestine, yet persons who proceeded from the midst of the Gentile Christians,* and had submitted to circumcision, acted here principally as the organs of this party, and exercised the greatest influence. To such the words of Paul in Gal. vi. 13 must relate;

* This entirely depends upon whether we adopt the *lectio recepta* in Gal. vi. 13, περιτμυμενοι, or the reading of the *codex Vaticanus* approved by Lachmann [and Tischendorf] ἀποτομυμενοι. I cannot help considering the first (which has the greatest number of original authorities in its favour) as the correct reading, partly on this account, that we cannot imagine any reason why any one should be induced to explain the latter, a word requiring no explanation, by the former, a more difficult one, and on the contrary, it may be easily accounted for, how a person might think of explaining the former by the latter. If the *lectio recepta* be the correct one, still the expression cannot refer to circumcised Jews, but only to Gentiles who suffered themselves to be circumcised. That the most influential seducers of the Galatian churches were such, appears to me to be intimated by the word ἀποκοφοντες, v. 12. Hence may be better explained the impassioned terms proceeding from a truly holy zeal, with which Paul speaks against these persons. If *circumcision* be not enough for them, let them have *excision* also; if falling away from the religion of the spirit, they seek their salvation in these outward worthless things and would make themselves dependent upon them. The pathos with which he here speaks, testifies his zeal for the salvation of souls, and for the elevated spiritual character of Christianity, and against all ceremonial services, by which Christianity and human nature would be degraded. And there is no occasion for the apology made by Jerome, although what he says is correct, that we must still look on the apostle as a man subject to human affections: "Nec mirum esse si Apostolus, ut homo et adhuc vasculo clausus infirmo semel fuerit hoc loquutus, in quod frequenter sanctos viros cadere perspicimus."

that even those who were circumcised, or wished to be so, did not themselves observe the law. These must have been originally Gentiles, and, on this supposition, it is less difficult to understand, how he could say of them that they themselves did not observe the law,—for to persons who had grown up in heathenism, it could not be so easy a matter to practise the complete round of Jewish observances. But, as is most generally the case with proselytes, they were peculiarly zealous for the party to which, notwithstanding their Grecian descent, they had devoted themselves, and their influence with their countrymen was far more dangerous than that of the Jewish false teachers.

Such a mixture of Judaism and Christianity threatened to destroy the whole essence of Christianity, and to substitute a Jewish ceremonial service in the place of a genuine Christian conversion proceeding from a living faith, and the danger which thus threatened the divine work made a deep impression on the apostle. In order to give the Galatian Christians an evidence of his love, of which the Judaizers wished to excite a mistrust, and to make it evident what importance he attached to the subject, he undertook to write an epistle to them *with his own hand*, contrary to his usual custom, and a difficult task for one who, amidst his manifold engagements, had little practice in writing Greek.*

* Although the proper meaning of the Greek *ἑαυτοῦ*, Gal. vi. 11, would lead us to understand it as referring to the large unshapely letters of an unpractised writer, yet I could never find in the words so understood, an expression corresponding to the earnestness of the apostle, and the tone of the whole epistle. Why should he not have expressed, in a more natural manner, how toilsome he had found the task of merely writing in this language? See Schott's Commentary. We are inclined to believe, that he uses the word in the less proper sense for *versus*, as in the later Latin authors we often find *quanti* for *quot*. And we may refer it most naturally to the whole epistle, as written with his own hand. It will also agree with the use of the word *ἑαυτοῦ*, when applied to an epistle. But, on the other hand, the use of the dative in this case is unusual, and not agreeable to the Paul-

He begins his epistle with declaring that his apostolic call was given him immediately by Christ himself, as to the other apostles; he assures the Galatian Christians in a most solemn manner that there could be no other gospel than that which he had announced to them, and that it was far from his thoughts to be influenced by the desire of his pleasing men in his mode of publishing the gospel;* though when enthralled in Pharisaism, he was actuated only by a regard to human authority. But since he had devoted himself to the service of Christ, he had renounced all such considerations, and taught and acted in obedience to the divine call, as responsible to God alone.† He proved to them by a lucid statement

ine phraseology, and to the frequent use of the word *πιστολη*, for an epistle. The reason of his writing the whole epistle with his own hand, was certainly not to guard against a falsification of it, or the forgery of another in his name, for his opponents, in this instance, were under no temptation to do this, since they were not desirous of ascribing to him any other doctrine than that of his own, but were at issue with him respecting the truth of that doctrine, and actually impugned his apostolic authority. The connection of the passage plainly shews us for what purpose he so expressly stated that he had written the whole with his own hand, namely, to testify that his love for them induced him to undergo any labour on their account, in contrast with the false teachers whom he had described in the following verses as seeking their own glory.

* The Judaizers accused him of this in reference to the Gentiles.

† Schrader misunderstands Gal. i. 10, when he applies it only to Jews and Judaizing Christians. If we apply the assertion here made in the most general terms, according to the sense intended by Paul, we shall understand it of Gentiles and Gentile Christians. Paul wished to defend himself against the accusation of the Jews, that he wilfully falsified the doctrine of Christ, in order to make it acceptable to the heathen. The *ἀγρι* marks the opposition of his conduct as the *δούλος χειρῶν* to his former Pharisaism, of which he afterwards speaks more at large. This view of the passage does away with an inference which Schrader attempts to draw from it, that Paul wrote this epistle during the time of his imprisonment at Rome.

of facts, that from the first he published the gospel in consequence of immediate divine illumination, and independently of all human authority; and that the other apostles had acknowledged his independent apostolic character.* With the firmest conviction that salvation and all the fulness of the divine life were to be found only by faith in the Crucified, he turns to the Galatian Christians with the exclamation, "Ye fools, who hath so bewitched you! to forget Jesus the Crucified, whom we have set forth before your eyes as the only ground of our salvation, and to seek in outward things, in the works of the law, that salvation for which ye must be indebted to him alone! Are ye so void of understanding, that after ye have begun your Christianity in the spirit, in the divine life which proceeds from faith, ye can seek after something higher still (the perfecting of your Christianity), in the low, the sensuous, and the earthly, in that which can have no elevating influence on the inner life of the Spirit, in the observance of outward ceremonies!" He appeals to the evidence of their own experience, that though from the first the gospel had been published to them independently of the law, yet by virtue of faith in the Redeemer alone, the divine power of the gospel had revealed itself among them by manifold operations, among which he reckoned the miracles to which he alludes in ch. iii. 5.

As his opponents supported themselves on the autho-

* The chief points which it was important for the apostle to establish were these:—that before he made his first journey to Jerusalem, after his conversion, he had appeared as an independent preacher of the gospel—that his first journey to Jerusalem had altogether a different object from being taught by the apostles the right method of preaching the gospel—and that it was not till after he had preached the gospel alone for some years, that he conversed with the most distinguished of the apostles, to whom the Judaizers themselves were wont to appeal, respecting their different method, and notwithstanding that difference, they still acknowledged him as a genuine apostle. Paul's object by no means required a recital of all his journeys to Jerusalem. See the remarks of Bauer in the "Tübinger Zeitschrift," 1831. Part 4, p. 112.

urity of the Old Testament, Paul shews, on the other hand, that the final aim of its contents was to prepare for the appearance of the Redeemer, by whom the wall of separation that had hitherto existed among men was to be taken away, and all men by virtue of faith in him were to receive a divine life; that the promises given to Abraham were annexed to the condition of faith, and would be fulfilled in all who were followers of Abraham in faith, as his genuine spiritual children; that the manifestation of the law formed only a preparatory intervening period between the giving of the promise and its fulfilment by the appearance of the Redeemer. He placed Judaism and heathenism—though, in other respects, he viewed these religions as essentially different—in one class in relation to Christianity; the standing-point of pupillage in religion, in relation to the standing-point of maturity which the children of God attained for the full enjoyment of their rights; the standing-point of the dependence of religion on outward, sensible things, an outward cultus, consisting in various ceremonies in relation to the standing-point of a religion of freedom (which proceeded from faith) of the spirit, and of the inward life.

As his opponents charged him with a want of uprightness, and with releasing the Gentiles from the burdensome observance of the law, merely from a wish to ingratiate himself with them, he could adopt no more suitable method of vindicating himself, and of infusing confidence into the Galatian Christians, than by proposing the example of his own life for imitation. He lived among the Gentiles as a Gentile, without submitting to the restrictions of the Mosaic Law, which certainly he would not have done if he had believed that it was impossible to attain the full possession of the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom without the observance of the law. Hence he made this demand on the Galatians (iv. 12), "Become as I am (in reference to the non-observance of the law), for I am become as you are, like you as Gentiles in the non-observance of the law, although a native Jew."* Now,

* I agree with Usteri in the explanation of these words,

if his method of becoming to the Jews a Jew, by observing the ceremonies of the law when amongst them in Palestine, had been at all inconsistent with what he here said of himself, he would not have appealed with such confidence to his own example. But, according to his own principles, such a contradiction could not exist; for, if he did not constantly observe the ceremonies of the law, but only under certain relations and circumstances; this sufficiently shewed that he no longer ascribed to them an objective importance, that according to his conviction they could contribute nothing to the justification and sanctification of men; and as this was his principle in reference to all outward, and in themselves indifferent things, he only submitted to them for the benefit of others, according to the dictates of wisdom and love.

Paul called upon the Galatians to stand firm in the liberty gained for them by Christ, and not to bring themselves again under the yoke of bondage. He assured them, that if they were circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing; that every man who submitted to circumcision was bound to observe the whole law; that since they sought to be justified by the law, they had renounced their connection with Christ, they were fallen from the possession of grace. What he here says, is by no means inconsistent with his allowing Timothy to be circumcised, and accommodating himself in outward usages to the Jewish Christians.* For he means not outward circumcision considered in itself, but in its con-

That the Galatians had at that time adopted the practice of Jewish ceremonies, and therefore Paul could not in this respect say, "I am become like you,"—can form no valid objection to this interpretation; for the Galatian Christians, all of whom certainly had not devoted themselves to the observance of the law, still belonged to the stock of the Gentiles, and with this view, the term *ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου* is used.

* Keil believes that he has detected an inconsistency in principle, and hence concluded, that this epistle belonged to an earlier period in the apostle's life, preceding the apostolic convocation, since in his first zeal after his conversion he indulged in a rude vehemence against Judaism, which afterwards was softened.

nection with the religious principle involved in it, as far as the Gentile who submitted to circumcision did so in the conviction that by it, and therefore by the law (to whose observance a man was bound by circumcision) justification was to be obtained. And this conviction stood in direct opposition to that disposition which felt indebted to the Saviour alone for salvation.

The apostle, in contrasting his true upright love to the Galatian Christians, with the pretended zeal of the Judaizers for their salvation, said to them, "They have a zeal on your account, but not in the right way; but they wish to exclude you from the kingdom of God in order that you may be zealous about them, that is, they wish to persuade you, that you cannot as uncircumcised Gentiles enter the kingdom of God, in order that you may emulate them, that you may be circumcised as they are, as if thus only you can become members of the kingdom of God. Those who are disposed of their outward pre-eminence (of outward Judaism), compel you to be circumcised only that they may not be persecuted with the cross of Christ, that is, with the doctrine of Christ the Crucified, as the only ground of salvation, that they may not be obliged to owe their salvation to Him alone, and to renounce all their merits, all in which they think themselves distinguished above others.* They wish you to

* I here adopt an interpretation of the words in Gal. vi. 12, different from that which from ancient times has been received by most expositors, and which, without being closely examined, has been mentioned by Usteri only with unqualified disapprobation. I will therefore state a few things in its favour. The common explanation of the passage is, "These persons compel you to be circumcised, only because they are not willing to be persecuted for the cross of Christ; that is, in order to avoid the persecutions which the publication of the doctrine of justification through faith alone, in Jesus the Crucified, will bring upon them from the Jews." The use of the dative suits this interpretation, although I believe that Paul, if he had wished to give utterance to this simple thought, would have expressed himself more plainly. Gal. v. 11 is in favour of this interpretation, where Paul says of himself, that if he still preached the necessity of cir-

be circumcised only that they may glory in your flesh, that is, in the change which they have outwardly effected

cumcision, then the offence which the Jews took at Christianity, on account of the doctrine that a man by faith in the Crucified, might become an heir of the kingdom of heaven, without the observance of the law—would at once be taken away, and that no reason would be left for persecuting him as a preacher of the gospel. But in order to avoid such persecutions on the part of the Jews, these persons need only observe the law strictly themselves, and beware of publishing the doctrine, that a man could be justified without the works of the law; by no means would they thereby be obliged to press circumcision so urgently on the Gentiles already converted, nor does Paul ever ascribe to his Judaizing opponents the design of avoiding the persecution that threatened them by such conduct. And if, according to the indications that have been pointed out, the most influential opponents of Paul in the Galatian churches were of Gentile descent, this interpretation would still less hold good, for Gentiles might bring persecutions on themselves sooner by the observance of Jewish ceremonies, than by the observance of the Christian religion, which was not conspicuous in outward rites. And how would this interpretation snit the connection? Paul says (Gal. vi. 12), "Those who wish to have some pre-eminence in outward things (some outward distinction before others) oblige you to be circumcised." After this, we expect something related to it, in the clause beginning with *ἵνα μὴ*, something that may serve as an exegesis, or to fix the meaning. But, according to that interpretation, something quite foreign would follow—that thereby they wish to avoid persecution. If this thought followed, Paul would have said at first—"Those who long after ease for the flesh, or who are afraid to bear the cross of Christ (or something of the kind), force circumcision upon you," &c. Verse 14 also shews, that all the emphasis is laid on *glorying* alone on the cross of Christ, which is opposed to setting a high value on any other *glorying*. The thought arising from that interpretation appears quite foreign to the context, both before and after. On the other hand, the interpretation I have adopted suits it entirely. That *ἐν σαρξὶ* is *σὰρξ*, that *καυχῆσθαι κατὰ σὰρκα* is taken away, if men can glory only in the cross of Christ. Hence they consider the cross of Christ, that is, the doctrine of faith in the Crucified, the only sufficient means of salvation, as something wearing a hostile aspect towards them, by which they are persecuted, since it obliges them to renounce

in you, by bringing you over altogether to the Jewish-Christian party." The apostle, lastly, adjured the Galatians that they would not give him any further trouble, since he bore in his body the mark of the sufferings he had endured for the cause of Christ.*

During his residence at Ephesus, the affairs of the Corinthian church demanded his special attention. The history of this community presents us with an image of those appearances and disturbances which have been often repeated in later periods of the church on a larger scale. A variety of influences mingled their action on this church, and it is impossible to deduce every thing from one common ground of explanation, such as the re-

their fancied superiority. With the positive clause in v. 12, "those who wish to have some pre-eminence according to the flesh," the negative clause agrees very well, "that they may not be persecuted with or by the cross of Christ, (the cross of Christ is something subjective to them, by which they are persecuted). The mention of the cross first, according to the best accredited reading adopted by Lachmann, suits this view of the passage. According to the other view, all the emphasis is to be placed on the not being persecuted. On the whole, the leading idea of the whole passage appears to be, Glorifying in the cross of Christ, in opposition to glorying in the flesh.

* If we only consider what is narrated in the Acts of his sufferings hitherto, though it is evident from a comparison with 2 Cor. xi. that all is not mentioned, we shall be as little disposed as by what the apostle says of the persecutions of the Jews, to apply these words (with Schrader) to his imprisonment at Rome. What Paul says in ch. ii. 10, respecting the fulfilment of obligations to the poor at Jerusalem, might favour the later composition of this epistle, but proves nothing; for the words by no means lead us to think of that last large collection, of which he undertook to be the bearer to Jerusalem. He might very often have sent separate contributions from the churches of Gentile Christians to Jerusalem, although, owing to the imperfections of church history, we have no certain information respecting them. On his last journey preceding his last visit to the Galatians, he might have brought with him one of these smaller collections.

lation * between the different parties ; although one common cause may be found which will explain many of these influences, in the particular situation of the Christian church, which the new Christian spirit had but partially penetrated, opposed as it was by former habits of life and the general state of society. Many of the easily excited and mobile Greeks had been carried away by the powerful impression of Paul's ministry made at Corinth, and at first shewed great zeal for Christianity ; but the essence of Christianity had taken no deep root in their unsettled dispositions. In a city like Corinth, where so great a corruption of morals prevailed, and so many incentives to the indulgence of the passions were presented on every side, such a superficial conversion was exposed to the greatest danger. In addition to this, after Paul had laid the foundation of the church, other preachers followed him who published the gospel partly in another form, and partly on other principles, and who, since their various constitutional peculiarities were not properly subordinated to the essential principles of the gospel, gave occasion to many divisions among the Greeks, a people naturally inclined to parties and party disputes. † There ‡ were at first persons of the same spirit as those

* By attempting to deduce too much from this single cause, Storr has indulged in many forced interpretations and suppositions.

† Owing to this national characteristic, the efficiency of the gospel among them was much disturbed and weakened in after ages.

‡ Rückert thinks that the order in which the parties are mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 12, corresponds to the period of their formation ; that first the preaching of Apollos occasioned the formation of such a division in the church, who felt a greater partiality to Apollos than to Paul, and were no longer satisfied with the latter, though they had not yet formed themselves into a particular party ; then the Judaizers would take advantage of such a state of feeling, and join the favourers of Apollos in opposition to Paul : thus two parties would be formed. But, in course of time, the original partisans of Apollos would discover that they could not agree with the Judaizers, who had at first, in order to find an entrance, con-

false teachers of the Galatian churches, who wished to introduce a Christianity more mingled with Judaism—who could not endure the independence and freedom with which the gospel published by Paul was developed among the Gentiles, although they were not so violent as the Galatian false teachers, and accordingly named themselves, not after James, whom the most decided Judaizers made their chief authority, but after Peter. Moreover, we must carefully notice the difference of circumstances. The Galatian churches could be more easily operated upon by organs of the Judaizing party who came forward from among themselves; it was altogether different at Corinth, where the Judaizers had to operate upon men of a decidedly Grecian character, who were not so susceptible of the influence of Judaism. Hence they could not venture to come forward at once, and disclose their intentions: it was necessary first to prepare the soil, before they scattered the seed;—to act warily and gently; to accomplish their work gradually; to employ a variety of artifices in order to undermine the principles on which Paul preached the gospel; to infuse a mistrust of his apostolic character, and thus to alienate the affections of his converts from him.* They began with casting doubts on Paul's apostolic dignity, for the reasons which have been before mentioned; they set in opposition to him, as the only genuine apostles, those who were

cealed their peculiarities, and thus at last there would be three distinct parties. But this passage (i. 12) cannot avail for determining the chronological relation of these parties to one another. Paul here follows the *logical* relation, without adverting to the chronological order. He places the partisans of Apollos next to those of Paul, because they only formed a particular section of the Pauline party; he then mentions those who were their most strenuous opponents, and lastly, those through whose existence the other parties would be presupposed. We have throughout no data by which to determine the chronological connection of the three first parties.

* See the remarks of Bauer, in his essay on the Christ-party in the Corinthian church (in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831, part iv. p. 83).

instructed and ordained by Christ himself. They understood besides how to instil into anxious minds a number of scruples, to which a life spent in intercourse with heathens would easily give rise, and which persons who had been previously proselytes to Judaism must have been predisposed to entertain.

Persons whose minds took this direction, placed Peter as an apostle chosen by the Lord himself, and especially distinguished by him, in opposition to Paul, who had assumed the office at a later period. When the strongly marked peculiarities of any of the apostles were blended with their views of Christianity, and it presented them in a varied form, it was in accordance with the different spheres of activity assigned them by God, and served not to injure the unity of the Christian spirit, but rather in this very manifoldness to illustrate its excellence; but now among those who attached themselves to this or the other apostles, one-sided tendencies became prominent, and that variety which might have consisted with unity, was formed by them into an exclusive contrariety. As a one-sided Petrine party was formed in the Corinthian church, so a one-sided Pauline party sprung up in opposition to it, which recognised the Pauline as the only genuine form of Christianity, ridiculed the nice distinctions of scrupulous consciences, and set themselves in stern opposition to every thing Jewish. In one of their tendencies we find the germ of the later Judaizing sects, and in the other that of the later Marcionite error.

But in the Pauline party itself, a two-fold direction was manifested, on the following grounds. Among the disciples of John who came to Ephesus, and considered themselves as Christians, though their knowledge was very defective, was Apollos, a Jew of Alexandria, who had received the Jewish-Grecian education, peculiar to the learned among the Alexandrian Jews, and a great facility in the use of the Greek language.* Aquila and

* The epithet *εὐνοη λόγιος* given to him in Acts xviii. 24, probably denotes, not an eloquent but a learned man, which would best suit an Alexandrian, since a learned literary edu-

his wife instructed him more accurately in Christianity, and when he was about to sail to Achaia, commended him to the Corinthian church as a man who, by his zeal and peculiar gifts, would be able to do much for the furtherance of the divine cause, especially at Corinth, where his Alexandrian education would procure him a more ready access to a part of the Jews and Gentiles. His Alexandrian mode of developing and representing Christian truths, as it approached to the Grecian taste, was peculiarly adapted to the educated classes at Corinth; but fascinated by it, they attached too great importance to this peculiar form, and despised, in contrast with it, the simple preaching of Paul, who, when he taught among them, determined to know nothing save Jesus the Crucified. We here see the germ of that Gnosis which sprung up in the soil of Alexandria, and aimed at exalting itself above the simple faith (Pistis) of the gospel.

But it has been lately maintained,* that the difference

cation, and not eloquence, was the precise distinction of the Alexandrians; and his disputation with the Jews at Corinth suits this meaning of *λογισ*, taken from the Jewish standing-point. In this sense the word is found both in Josephus and Philo; in the first, *λογισ* is opposed to *διωσεις*, De Bel. Jud. vi. 5, § 3; and by Philo, De Vita Mosis, i. § 5, *Αιγυπτίων οι λογισ*. But another meaning of the word as it was used at that time is also possible, and since it appears from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, that Apollos was also a man eloquent in the Greek language, so that we are left in some uncertainty how to understand this epithet. According to the first interpretation, "*δυνατος ώς εν ταῖς γραφαῖς*," would only more precisely express what is contained in *λογισ*; according to the second, it would be a perfectly new and distinct characteristic. This exegetical question is of no importance historically, for certainly both epithets are applicable to Apollos.

* By a distinguished young theologian, the licentiate Daniel Schenkel, in his "Inquisitio critico-historica de Ecclesia Corinthiaca, primæva, Basileæ 1838," with which De Wette, in his late Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, has expressed his concurrence.

between the Pauline party and that of Apollos, related not to any difference in the form of doctrine, but only to the position in which Paul and Apollos stood to the founding of the Corinthian church, as the apostle himself, in 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7, indicates, that it was made a question, whether he who laid the foundation, or he who raised the superstructure, deserved the pre-eminence. But if we follow this hint, it will conduct us much further. We cannot stop short at these merely outward relations, but must seek in the characteristic qualities of these two men, who stood in such different relations to the church, for the reason, that some were more attached to the one, and some to the other. We may presume that the manner in which one laid the foundation, and the other raised the superstructure, depended on the difference on their characteristic qualities. To this difference Paul himself adverts, when, after speaking of the merely outward relations between himself and Apollos, he represents in figurative language how every genuine teacher of Christianity ought to proceed in building on the foundation that has been once laid; 1 Cor. iii. 12. The connection evidently shews, that Paul had primarily in view his relation to the party of Apollos; every other explanation is forced.* If we compare the qualities possessed by the apostle and his fellow-labourer, as far as our information extends, we may easily infer the difference in their mode of teaching, and in their respective partisans. That Paul possessed great force and command of language, we may conclude with

* We must carefully distinguish those who, by assailing the unchangeable foundation of Christianity, destroyed the temple of God in the church, 1 Cor. iii. 16 and 17, from those of whom Paul judged far more leniently, because they preserved inviolate the foundation that was laid, though they added to it what was more or less human. Of the latter, he affirms that, since they held fast the foundation of salvation, they would finally be partakers of salvation, though after a painful and repeated process of purification; of the others, that they would come to ruin, because they had destroyed the work of God.

certainty from his epistles, as is also evinced by his discourse at Athens. In that eloquence which is adapted to seize powerfully on men's minds, he was inferior to no preacher of the gospel, not even to Apollos himself. It was his peculiar natural gift, sanctified and elevated by spiritual influence for the cause of the gospel, in which he was probably superior to Apollos; and if the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be attributed to the latter, and we compare it with those of Paul, it would serve to confirm the opinion. In dialectic power also, which was founded on the peculiar character of his intellect, and developed and improved by his youthful training in the schools of the Pharisees, as well as in the skilful interpretation and use of the Old Testament, he was surpassed by none. But still between himself and Apollos a difference not unimportant existed, which affected their peculiar style of teaching; the latter, as an Alexandrian, had received an education more adapted to the Grecian mind and taste, and possessed a greater familiarity with the pure Grecian phraseology, in which Paul was defective, as we may gather from his epistles, and as he expressly asserts; 2 Cor. xi. 6. Now, in making the gospel known at Corinth, he had special reasons for rejecting all the aids that otherwise were at his command for recommending evangelical truth, and for using only the "demonstration of the spirit and of power," which accompanied its simple annunciation. The Alexandrian refinement of Apollos must have formed a striking contrast to the simplicity of Paul's preaching; and, if we take into account the circumstances and social relations of the Corinthians, we cannot wonder that a preference for such a style of address led to the formation of a distinct party in the Corinthian church. It was not the peculiar style of Apollos in itself which Paul condemned;—it became every teacher to work with the gifts entrusted to him, according to the standing-point on which the Lord had placed him;—but he combated the one-sided and arrogant over-valuation of this talent, the excessive estimation in which this form of mental culture was held. It by no means follows, that he attributed a false wisdom to Apollos him-

self;* but the one-sided direction of his partisans, in which the σοφία ζήτησις predominated, would easily produce a false wisdom, by which evangelical truth would be obscured or pushed into the back-ground. Paul perceived this threatening danger, and hence felt himself impelled strenuously to combat the principle on which such a tendency was founded.

Besides the parties already mentioned, we find a fourth in the Corinthian church, whose peculiarities it is more difficult to ascertain, since, judging from its name, we cannot readily suppose that it belonged to a sect blamed by the apostle, and in no other part of the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, do we find any distinct references to it from which we might infer its specific character; it was composed of persons who said that they were "*of Christ*;" 1 Cor. i. 12. If we consider this party as involved in the censure expressed by the apostle,† which

* This charge against Apollos, in the opinion of Schenkel and De Wette, is well founded, but by no means follows from the view taken by ourselves and others of the peculiarities of the party of Apollos.

† The interpretation which has been proposed by Pott and Schott, and according to which, all conjectures respecting the peculiar character of a Christ-party at Corinth would be superfluous, is grammatically possible. It assumes that Paul, in this passage, only enumerated historically the various parties in the Corinthian church, without concluding that all who are specified came under the censure of the apostle. Those indeed who firmly adhered to the doctrine taught by Paul, and esteemed him, as he wished, only as an organ of Christ,—those who wished to keep aloof from all party contentions, and called themselves only after Christ their common head, must be represented as a particular party in relation to the other Corinthian parties, and hence Paul distinguished them by the name which they assumed in opposition to all party feelings. If these words in this connection only contained an historical enumeration of the various parties, such an interpretation might be valid. But this is not the case. Paul evidently mentions these parties in terms of censure. The censure applies to all equally as parties who substituted something in the place of that single relation to Christ which alone was of real worth. "Has then Christ

the grammatical construction of the passage seems to require, we must believe that these persons did not wish to be "of Christ," in the sense in which Paul desired that all the Corinthians should be, but that they appropriated Christ to themselves in an erroneous sense, and wished to make him, as it were, the head of their party. And we must then suppose that the apostle, though with an allusion in the first instance to their party designation, yet including a reference to all the Corinthian parties, said, "Is the one Christ become divided? has each party their portion of Christ, as their own Christ? No! there is only one Christ for all, who was crucified for you, to whom ye were devoted and pledged by baptism."

We have now to inquire what can be determined respecting the character and origin of this Christ-party? If we pay any regard to its being mentioned next to the party of Peter, and compare it with the collocation of the parties of Apollos and Paul, we might think it most probable that the relation between the two former was similar to that which existed between the two latter; and that, therefore, a subdivision of the general party of Jewish Christians was intended. And as part of these attached themselves to Peter, and part to James, we might be induced to imagine a party belonging to James along with the Petrine; the former more tenacious and violent in their Judaism; the latter more liberal and moderate. But this supposition is not at all favoured by

become divided?" he proceeds to ask. "No—he will not allow himself to be divided. Ye ought all to call yourselves after that one Christ who redeemed you by his death on the cross, and to whom ye were devoted by baptism." These words are directed equally against all parties, and perhaps exactly in this form, owing to the preceding designation of those who arrogantly named themselves *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. But if these persons had assumed this title in the sense which Paul approved, he would not have classed them with those who incurred his censure; these words could not have applied to them, but he must have expressed his approbation of their spirit, which must have appeared to him as the only right one.

the designation, "*οἱ τοῦ χριστοῦ*," for it seems very unnatural that the adherents of James should so name themselves, as some have imagined,* because the epithet *ἀδελφοί τοῦ χριστοῦ* was given to that apostle as a title of honour. There can be no doubt that if such a party had existed in Corinth, they would have called themselves *οἱ τοῦ Ἰακωβοῦ*.

If we believe that the Christ-party was composed of Jewish Christians, such a view must be stated and developed very differently in order to bring it nearer to probability.† The name *οἱ τοῦ χριστοῦ*—it may be said—was one which the partisans of Peter assumed in opposition to Paul and his disciples, in order to mark themselves as those who adhered to the genuine apostles of Christ, from whom they had received the pure doctrine of Christ, and thus by their teachers were connected with Christ himself: and, on the other hand, by applying this title exclusively to their own party, they intended to brand the other Christians at Corinth as those who did not deserve the name of Christians, who were not the disciples of Christ, nor the scholars of a genuine apostle of Christ, but of a man who had adulterated the pure Christian doctrine, and had promulgated a doctrine of his own arbitrary invention as the doctrine of Christ. This view would appear perfectly to correspond with the phrase *οἱ τοῦ χριστοῦ*, and might be confirmed by many antithetical references in both the epistles in which Paul vindicates his genuine apostolic character, and asserts, that he could say with the same right as any one else, that he was "*of Christ*;" 2 Cor. x. 7. But while such passages certainly are directed against those who, on the grounds already mentioned, disputed Paul's apostolic authority,

* Attributed by Storr, or as by Berthold, to several *ἀδελφούς τοῦ κυρίου* among the first preachers of the gospel.

† As it has lately been developed with much acuteness, in the essay already referred to, by Bauer, in the "*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*," 1831, which no persons can read without instruction, even if they do not agree with the views of the writer on this point.

they by no means prove the existence of such a party-name among the Jews. And one difficulty still remains, namely, that by the position of the phrase *ἐν τοῦ χριστοῦ* we are led to expect the designation of a party in some way differing from the Petrine, though belonging to the same general division; but, according to this view, the Christ-party would differ from the Petrine only in name, which would be quite contradictory to the relation of this party-name to those that preceded it.* Accordingly, this view can only be tenable, if not a merely formal, but a material difference can be found between the two last parties. And it might be said that not all the members of the Petrine party, but only the most rigid and violent in their Judaism, who would not acknowledge the Pauline Gentile Christians as standing in communion with the Messiah, had applied to their Judaizing party the exclusive epithet of *ἐν τοῦ χριστοῦ*.

But it has always appeared to us to be contrary to historical analogy, that those persons who adhered to another apostle, and considered him alone as genuine in opposition to Paul, should not name themselves after one whom they looked upon as the necessary link of their connection with Christ. In the epistle itself, we cannot find allusions that would establish this, since the passages which contain these references can be very well understood without it.

We cannot hope in this inquiry to attain to conclusions altogether certain and sure, for the marks and historical data are not sufficient for the purpose. But we shall best guard against arbitrary conjectures, and arrive at the truth most confidently, if we first attend to what may be gathered from the name itself and its position, in rela-

* Bauer says indeed, p. 77, "The apostle's object in accumulating so many names, might be to depict the party spirit prevalent in the Corinthian church, which shewed itself in their delighting in the multiplication of sectarian names, which denoted various tints and shades, but not absolutely distinct parties." But if this were the case, that explanation only of one of these party-names can be correct, by which a different shade of party is pointed out.

tion to the other party-names, and then compare this with the whole state of the Corinthian church. In the results which may thus be obtained, we must then endeavour to separate the doubtful and disputable from the certain and probable.

We shall by no means be justified in concluding that, by virtue of the logical connection of the two members of the sentence to one another, the persons who named themselves after Christ must have borne the same relation to the Petrine party as the adherents of Apollos to those of Paul. This conclusion, if correct, would be favourable to the view which we last considered. But the relation of the two members is not logical only, but subject to certain historical conditions. Paul does not, as in other cases, form the members of the antithesis merely from the thoughts; but the manner in which he selected his terms was determined by matters of fact. As the Judaizers formed in reality only one party, Paul could designate them only by one name, and since he was obliged to choose his terms according to the facts, he could not make the two members exactly correspond to one another.

From the name of this party viewed in relation to other party-names, we shall arrive at the following conclusion with tolerable certainty. There were those who, while they renounced the apostles, professed to adhere to Christ alone, to acknowledge him only as their teacher, and to receive what he announced as truth from himself without the intervention of any other person. This was such a manifestation of self-will, such an arrogant departure from the historical process of development ordained by God in the appropriation of divine revelation, as would in the issue lead to arbitrary conduct respecting the contents of Christian doctrine; for the apostles were the organs ordained and formed by God, by whom the doctrine of Christ was to be propagated, and its meaning communicated to all men. But it might easily happen, while some were disposed to adhere to Paul alone, others to Apollos, and a third party to Peter, at last some persons appeared who were averse to acknowledge any of

these party-names, and professed to adhere to Christ alone, yet with an arrogant self-will which set aside all human instrumentality ordained by God. If we now view this as the result which presents itself to us with tolerable certainty, that there was at Corinth such a party desirous of attaching themselves to Christ alone, independently of the apostles, who constructed in their own way a Christianity different from that announced by the apostles, we may imagine three different ways in which they proceeded. For this object they might make use of a collection of the sayings of Christ, which had fallen into their hands, and set what they found there in opposition to the apostolic character; or they might pretend to derive their Christianity from an inward source of knowledge, either a supernatural inward light or the light of natural reason, either a more mystical or a more rational direction. If we assented to the first supposition, still we could not satisfy ourselves, without imagining a certain subjective element in the manner of explaining those discourses of Christ; for without the infusion of such an element, the tendency to this separation from the apostolic instrumentality could not have originated, and thus the principal question would still remain to be answered, whether we are to consider the subjective element as mystical or rational.

According to a hypothesis* lately developed with great acuteness, but resting on a number of arbitrary suppositions, the tendency we are speaking of must have been mystical. As Paul had considered the immediate revelation of Christ to himself as equivalent to the outward election of the other apostles; so there were other persons who thought that they could appeal to such an inward revelation or vision, who from this standing-point assailed the apostolic authority of Paul, while they sought to establish their own, and threatened to substitute an inward ideal Christ for the historical Christ. These re-

* By Schenkel in the essay before mentioned, and advocated by De Wette in his Commentary on the two Epistles to the Corinthians.

representatives of the one-sided mystical tendency, must have been the principal opponents with whom Paul had to contend. But in the Epistle to the Corinthians, we can find no trace of such a tendency combated by him ; and in all the passages to which the advocates of this hypothesis appeal, a reference to it seems to be arbitrarily imposed.

When Paul, at the beginning of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, so impressively brings forward the doctrine of Christ the Crucified, and says that he had published this in all its simplicity without attempting to support it by the Grecian philosophy, there is not the slightest intimation that such a tendency (as we have alluded to) existed in the Corinthian church, which aimed at substituting another Christ in the room of Christ the Crucified. In a place where, by the over-valuation of any kind of philosophy, the simple gospel was liable to be set in the back-ground, such language might very properly be used, even though no ideal or mystical Christ were substituted instead of the historical ; and, it is evident to what false conclusions we should be led, if we inferred from such a declaration the existence of a tendency that denied Christ the Crucified. Paul opposed the preaching of Jesus the Crucified to two tendencies,—the Jewish fondness for signs, and the arrogant philosophy of the Greeks, but never to a mystical tendency which would depreciate the historical facts of Christianity. Against a tendency of this kind, he would certainly have argued in a very different manner.

The sensuous tendency of the Jewish spirit we should expect to meet with in the Jewish part of the Corinthian church,—the pride of philosophy in those who attached themselves to Apollos, since from what has been said we must suppose that there was a distinct party composed of such persons. As Paul when he spoke against the Grecian pride of philosophy, had this party of Apollos specially in his mind, by a natural transition he spoke in the next place of his relation to Apollos.

The passage in 2 Cor. xi. 4 has been adduced to prove that Paul's opponents preached another Christ and an-

other gospel. Paul reproached the Corinthians with having given themselves up to such erroneous teachers. But in that whole section he occupies himself, not with combating a false doctrine, as he must have done if the representatives of a mysticism that undermined the foundations of the Christian faith had been his opponents; but he had only to combat the pretensions of persons who wished to make their own authority supreme in the Corinthian church, and not to acknowledge him as an apostle. These people themselves,—he says in the context—could not deny, that he had performed every thing which could be required of an apostle as founder of a Church, for he had preached to them the gospel of Jesus the Crucified and the Risen, and had communicated to them the powers of the Holy Spirit by his ministry. With justice these persons, he said, might appear against him, and assume the management of the church, if they could really shew that there was another Jesus than the one announced by Paul, another gospel than that which he proclaimed, or another Holy Spirit than that whose powers were efficient among them.*

* I account for the irregularity in the ἀνιχισθαι, 2 Cor. xi. 4, in this way,—that Paul was penetrated with the conviction, that the case, which in form he had assumed to be possible, was in fact impossible. This fourth verse is thus connected with the preceding; I fear that you have departed from Christian simplicity; for if it were not so, you could not have allowed yourselves to be governed by persons who could impart to you nothing but what you have received from me; for I consider (v. 5) myself to stand behind the chief apostles in no respect. By this analysis, the objections of De Wette against this interpretation are at once obviated. Against the other mode of explanation, I have to object that it does not suit the connection with v. 5; that the words would then be unnecessarily multiplied; that Paul would then hardly have used the words πνεῦμα ἵερον λαμβανειν, which refer only to receiving the Holy Spirit. I also think that he would then have said, not Ἰησοῦν, but χριστόν, for these mystics would rather have preached another Christ than this historical person Jesus; or as, at a later period, the Gnostics, who held similar notions, taught that there was not a twofold Jesus, but a twofold Christ, or distinguished between a heavenly

The opponents of these views of this passage believe like many others, that those who called themselves *οἱ τοῦ χριστοῦ* are mentioned by Paul himself in 2 Cor. x. 7. But here only such can be understood who boasted of a special internal connection with Christ. But I do not perceive why the epithet should not be applied to every person who thought that in any sense they particularly belonged to Christ, or could boast of any special connection with him. From the expression *κατὰ πρῶτον** it is clear that these persons boasted of an outward connection with Christ, which certainly would not suit the representatives of a mystical tendency. Indeed, throughout the whole section he distinguishes the opponents of whom he is speaking, as those who wished to establish a purely outward pre-eminence (2 Cor. xi. 8), founded on their Jewish descent, and their connection with the apostles chosen by Christ himself, and with the original church in Palestine. Would Paul, if he had to do with such idealising mystics, have only conceded to them that they stood in connection with Christ, that they could call themselves his servants? Would he not from the first have made it a question whether it was the true Christ after whom they called themselves? And how can it be imagined that Paul, if his opponents were of this class, would have used expressions which are directed rather against the sensuous perversion of the religious sentiment, and might easily be misinterpreted in favour of that false spiritualism? Would he have said, "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more; but only a spiritual Christ who is exalted above all limited earthly relations, with whom we can now enter into communion in a spiri-

Christ and a human Jesus. On the contrary, according to the interpretation which I have followed, Paul would of course say, "another *Jesus* than the one I preach," referring to an historical personage, and the events of his life.

* A comparison of the passage in 2 Cor. v. 12, (where the *οἱ πρῶτον* is opposed to *καρδίᾳ*), appears to me to prove that the words must be so understood; the antithesis of the outward and the inward is quite in Paul's style.

tual manner, since we have a share in the new spiritual creation proceeding from him ;" 2 Cor. v. 16-17.*

When Paul appealed to the revelations imparted to him, it was not for the confutation of those who supported themselves only by such inward experiences ; but of those principally who would not acknowledge him as a genuine apostle, equal to those who were chosen by Christ during his earthly life,—the same persons, against whom he maintained his independent apostolic commission, as delivered to him by Christ on his personal appearance to him ; 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2.

Had he been called to oppose the tendency of a false mysticism and spiritualism, he, who understood so well how to strike at the root of error and delusion, would have certainly entered more fully into conflict with an erroneous direction of the religious sentiment, so dangerous to genuine Christianity, for which he would have had the best opportunity in treating of the gifts of the Spirit.

We must then consider this view of the Christ-party, as entirely unsupported by this epistle of Paul, and only deduced from it by a number of arbitrary interpretations.† While those whose views we are opposing, trace the origin of such a party to a certain tendency of Judaism, we, on the contrary, are obliged to refer it to a Grecian element.

From the peculiar qualities of the Grecian mind, which was not disposed to submit itself to an objective authority, but readily moulded every thing in a manner conformable to its own subjectivity, such a tendency

* These words contain a contrast to his former Jewish standing-point, and his earlier conception of the character of the Messiah ; also to all that was antecedent to Christianity, and independent of it ; for from this standing-point all things must in some measure become new.

† I find no ground for a comparison with Montanism, Marcion, and the Clementines, and I must consider as arbitrary the explanations that have been given of the first epistle of Clemens Romanus (to which, too, I cannot ascribe so high an antiquity), in order to elucidate the affairs of the Corinthian church in the times of the apostle Paul.

as that we have been speaking of, might easily proceed.* At that time, there were many educated and half-educated individuals, who were dissatisfied with the popular Polytheism. These persons listened to the words of Christ, which impressed them by their sublimity and spirituality, and believed that in him they had met with a reformer of the religious condition of mankind, such as they had been longing for. We have already remarked, that a collection of the memorable actions and discourses of Christ, had most probably been in circulation from a very early period. Might they not have procured such a document, and then constructed by means of it, a peculiar form of Christian doctrine, modelled according to their Grecian subjectivity? These persons probably belonged to the class of the wisdom-seeking Greeks, at which we need not be surprised, although the Christian church made little progress among the higher classes, since in this city a superior degree of refinement was universally prevalent, and from the words which tell us, that in the Corinthian church, *not many* of the philosophically trained, *not many* of the highest class were to be found, we may infer, that *some* such persons must have belonged to it; one individual is mentioned in Romans xvi. 23, who filled an important civil office in Corinth.†

But against this supposition, the same objections may be urged, which we made against another view of the Christ-party, that Paul has not specially directed his argumentation against the principles of such a party, though they threatened even more than those of other

* The reasons alleged by Bauer, in his late essay on this subject, why such a form of error could not exist at this time, do not convince me.

† Bauer says (p. 11), "Religion, not philosophy, would lead to Christianity." But it is not altogether improbable, that a person might be led by a religious interest, which could find no satisfaction in the popular religion, to philosophy, and by the same interest be carried onwards to Christianity, without adopting it in its unalloyed simplicity. Why should not such phenomena, which certainly occurred in the second century, have arisen from the same causes at this period?

parties to injure apostolic Christianity. Still what he says on other occasions, respecting the only source of the knowledge of truths that rest on divine Revelation;—and against the presumption of unenlightened reason, setting herself up as an arbitress of divine things; and on the nothingness of a proud philosophy, (1 Cor. ii. 11,) forms the most powerful argumentation against the fundamental error of this party, though he might not have it specially in view; and it is a never-failing characteristic of the apostle's mode of controversy, that he seizes hold of the main roots of error, instead of busying himself too much (as was the practice of later ecclesiastical polemics) with its branches and offsets. Nor is it altogether improbable, that the adherents of this party were not numerous, and exercised only a slight influence in the church. They occupied too remote a standing-point to receive much benefit from the warnings and arguments of Paul, and he had only to set the church on its guard against an injurious intercourse with such persons. "Be not deceived (said he), evil communications corrupt good manners." 1 Cor. xv. 33.

The opposition between the Pauline and Petrine parties, or the Jewish and Gentile Christians, was in reference to the relations of life, the most influential of all these party differences, and gave rise to many separate controversies. The Jews and Jewish Christians when they lived in intercourse with heathens, suffered much disquietude, if unawares they partook of any food which had been rendered unclean by its connection with idolatrous rites. Various rules were laid down by the Jewish theologians to determine what was, and what was not defiling, and various methods were devised for guarding against such defilement, on which much may be found in the Talmud. Now, as persons might easily run a risk of buying in the market portions of the flesh of animals which had been offered in sacrifice, or might have such set before them in houses where they were guests, their daily life was harassed with constant perplexities. Scruples on this point were probably found, not merely in those who were avowedly among the Ju-

daizing opponents of Paul, but also seized hold of many Christians of weaker minds. As faith in their false gods had previously exercised great influence over them, so they could not altogether divest themselves of an impression, that beings whom they had so lately revered as deities, were something more than creatures of the imagination. But from their new standing-point, this reflection of their ancient faith assumed a peculiar form. As the whole system of heathenism was in their eyes the kingdom of darkness, their deities were now transformed into evil spirits, and they feared lest, by partaking of the flesh consecrated to them,* they should come into fellowship with evil spirits.† That these scruples affected

* Thus Peter, in the Clementines, says to the heathens, "αρεφασαι τῶν λειτουργούντων ἱερειῶν τῶν χαλιῶν δαίμονας μεταλαμβάνει." Hom. xi. § 15.

† The passage in 1 Cor. viii. 7, may be understood of persons who, though they had passed over to Christian monotheism, were still in some measure entangled in polytheism, and could not entirely free themselves from the belief that the gods whom they had formerly served were divinities of a subordinate class; so that now such persons—since by partaking of the flesh of the victims they supposed that they entered again into connection with these divine beings—would be led to imagine, that their former idolatry was not wholly incompatible with Christianity, and thus might easily form an amalgamation of heathenism and Christianity. In later times, something of this kind we allow took place, in the transition from polytheism to monotheism; but in this primitive age, Christianity came at once into such direct conflict on these particulars with heathenism, that an amalgamation of this kind cannot be thought natural. Whoever had not wholly renounced idolatry would certainly not be received into the Christian church, nor would have so mildly passed judgment on *such* a weakness of faith. From such passages as Gal. v. 20, 1 Cor. vi. 9, we cannot conclude with certainty that, among those who had professed Christianity, there would be such who, after they had been led to Christianity by an impression which was not deep enough, allowed themselves again to join in the worship of idols; for Paul might here designedly class the vices he named with idolatry, in order to indicate that whoever indulged in the vices connected with idolatry, deserved to be ranked with idolaters.

not merely Judaizers, but other Christians also, is evident from a case in reference to which Paul gives specific directions. He supposes, namely, the case, that such weak believers were guests at the table of a heathen.* Now we may be certain, that none who belonged to the Judaizers would make up their minds to eat with a heathen.†

Those who in their own estimation were Pauline Christians, ridiculed a scrupulosity that thus made daily life uneasy, and fell into an opposite error. They had indeed formed right conceptions of the Pauline principles in reference to theory, but erred in the application, because the spirit of love and of wisdom was wanting. They said: "Idols are in themselves nothing, mere creatures of the imagination; hence, also the eating of the flesh that has been devoted to them, is a thing in itself indifferent. The Christian is bound by no law in such outward or indifferent things; all things are free to him; *παντα ἔστιν* was their motto. They appealed to their knowledge, to the power which they possessed as Christians; *γινώεις, ἔχουσία*, were their watchwords.

If we compare these passages with 1 Cor. v. 11, it will appear that some such instances occurred of a relapse into idolatry, but those who were thus guilty of participating in idolatry must have been excluded from all Christian communion.

* The scrupulosity of the Jews in this respect, appears in the Jewish-Christian work of the Clementines (though on other points sufficiently liberal), where the following words are ascribed to the apostle Peter, "*τραπιστῆς ἐνὶ ὧν οὐκ ἀπολαύομεν, ὅτι δὴ οὐδε συνιστάμεθα αὐτοῖς δυναμένοι διὰ το ἀκαθάρτων αὐτοὺς βιοῦν.*" No exception could be made in favour of parents, children, brothers or sisters.

† By the *τις*, 1 Cor. x. 58, on account of the relation to the first *τις*, v. 28, we understand it to mean the same person, the heathen host,—and it would be a very unlikely thing that such a person would remind his Christian guest, that he had set before him meat that had been offered to idols; but we must rather refer it to the weak Christian, who considered it to be his duty to warn his unscrupulous brother against partaking of such food, the same weak Christian whose conscience is spoken of in v. 29.

They had no consideration for the necessities of their weaker brethren; they easily seduced many among them to follow their example from false shame, that they might not be ridiculed as narrow-minded and scrupulous; such an one, who allowed himself to be induced by outward considerations to act contrary to his convictions, would afterwards be disturbed in his conscience. "Thus," said Paul, "through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died."* Many went such lengths in this pride of knowledge and this abuse of Christian freedom, that they scrupled not to take part in the festive entertainments, consisting of the flesh that was left after the sacrifices had been presented, which the heathens were wont to give their friends;—and thus they were easily carried on to indulge in those immoral excesses, which by the decrees of the apostolic convention at Jerusalem, were forbidden in connection with the eating of flesh sacrificed to idols. In fact, we here find the germ of a one-sided over-valuation of theoretic illumination, a misunderstanding of Christian freedom, a false adiaphorism in morals, which a later pseudo-pauline gnostic† tendency carried so far as to justify the grossest immoralities. But such wickedness certainly cannot be laid to the charge of the perverters of Christian freedom at Corinth. Though the heathen corruption of morals had infected many mem-

* We might here make use of the words attributed to Christ, taken from an apocryphal gospel, and quoted in Luke vi. 4, by the Codex Cantab.: "τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ διασκαμίνους τίνα ἐργαζομένοι τῇ σαββάτῃ ἵσταν αὐτῇ ἄνδρωσι, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἰ εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατακτάς καὶ παραβάτης εἰ τοῦ νόμου."—See *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 140.

† As was the case with those whom Porphyry mentions in his book *De Abstinencia Carnis*, i. § 43, who agree in their mode of expression very remarkably with the unscrupulous persons described by Paul: οὐ γὰρ ἡμᾶς μολοῦσι τὰ βρώματα (said they), ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὴν θαλάτταν τὰ ρυσαρά των εἰνυμάτων περιιυμῶμεν (like the Corinthian ἱεσουαζομένοι) γὰρ τῶν ἀπάντων, καθάπερ ἡ θαλάσσα τῶν ὕδατων πάντων. Ἐὰν εὐλαβηθῶμεν βρῶσιν, ἰδουλωθῶμεν τῷ τοῦ φόβου φρονήματι, διὸ δὲ πανθ' ἡμῖν ὑποτίταχθαι. They appeal to their βούλος ἱεσουαζομένοι.

bers of the Corinthian church, yet they were far from wishing to justify this immorality on such grounds, and had this been the case, Paul would have spoken with far greater severity against such a palliation of sin.*

The opposition between the Petrine and Pauline parties, had probably an influence on the different views of the married and single life. It was indeed the peculiar effect of Christianity, that it elevated all the moral relations based in human nature, in their pure human form, to a higher significance, so that after the original fountain of divine life had assumed humanity, in order, by revealing himself in it, to sanctify and glorify it—the striving after the godlike, was no more to shew itself in an unearthly direction, overstepping the bounds of human nature, but everywhere, the Divine humanized it-

* The departure from Christian truth in theory to so great an extent in the church at Corinth, has been received by many, owing to a misunderstanding of the apostle's language. They have been led to entertain this opinion, from believing that there is a strict objective connection between what Paul says in 1 Cor. vi. 12, and the beginning of v. 13, and what he says of the words *οὐκ ἐστὶν σώμα*, and from supposing that from v. 12, he had the same thought in view. But a comparison of vi. 12, with x. 23, will shew, that Paul at first meant only to speak of the partaking of the meat offered to idols, and to explain the subject more fully. With this reference, he had said in v. 13, the food and the stomach, whose wants it satisfies, are both transitory, designed only for this earthly existence. On these things the essence of the Christian calling cannot depend, which relates to the eternal and the heavenly. Compare 1 Cor. viii. 8, Rom. xiv. 17, Mat. xv. 17, and thus he was led to the contrast, "but the *form* alone of the body is transitory." According to its nature, the body is designed to be an imperishable organ devoted to the Lord, which will be awakened again in a nobler glorified form for a higher existence. It must, therefore, be even now withdrawn from the service of lust, and be formed into a sanctified organ belonging to the Lord. It might be, that there was floating in the apostle's mind a possible misunderstanding of his words, against which he wished to guard, or his controversy with the deniers of the doctrine of the resurrection at Corinth. In either case he would be led by these recollections to leave the topic with which he began, and to speak against

self, the divine life revealed itself in the forms of human development. Yet, as at first, before the elevating and all-penetrating influence of Christianity had manifested itself in all the relations of life, the earnest moral spirit of the gospel came into conflict with a world under the domination of sinful lusts ; so, for a short time, an ascetic tendency averse from the marriage union (which though not in accordance with the spirit of the gospel, might be excited by the opposition it made to the corruption of the world)—would easily make its appearance, especially since there was an expectation of the speedy passing away of all earthly things, antecedently to the perfect development of the kingdom of God. The conviction, that ere the kingdom of God would attain its perfection, the earthly life of mankind must in all its forms be penetrated by the life of the kingdom of God, and that all these forms would be made vehicles of its manifestation—this conviction could be formed only by degrees from the historical course of development. And as to what concerns marriage especially, Christ had certainly by presenting the idea of it as a moral union, requisite for

those excesses in the Corinthian church of which he had not thought at first. And this again led him to answer the questions proposed to him respecting the relation of the sexes. After that he returns again, at the beginning of the 8th chapter, to the subject of "things offered to idols," but from another point, and after several digressions to other subjects which may easily be explained from the association of ideas, he begun again in ch. x. v. 23, the exposition of his sentiments in the same form as in ch. vi. v. 12. What Billroth has said in his commentary, p. 83, against this interpretation, that thus we lose the evident contrast and parallelism between the words *τα βρώματα τῇ κοιλίᾳ, καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασι*, and *το δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῇ πορνείᾳ, ἀλλὰ τῇ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κύριος τῷ σώματι*, appears without foundation. It is only assumed that Paul formed this contrast from a more general view of the subject, and without limiting it to a perversion of the doctrine of Christian liberty, actually existing in the church. What De Wette has lately advanced in his commentary against this interpretation, has not altered my views, though I have examined with pleasure the reasons advanced by this distinguished critic.

the complete development of the type of humanity as transformed by the divine principle of life, and thus for the realization of the kingdom of God in a moral union of the sexes, designed for their mutual complement—by all this, he at once disowned the ascetic contempt of marriage, which views it only on its sensuous side, and rejects its true idea as realized in the divine life. Yet till Christianity had penetrated more into the life of humanity, and thereby had realized this idea of marriage as a peculiar form of manifestation belonging to the kingdom of God, zeal for the kingdom of God might view marriage as a relation tending to distract the mind, and to withdraw it from that one fundamental direction. And besides, though the Christian view in all its purity and completeness, was in direct opposition to the ascetic over-valuation of celibacy; yet Christianity was equally repugnant to the ancient Jewish notion, according to which celibacy was considered as a disgrace and a curse. As Christianity made every thing depend on the *disposition*, as it presented the means of salvation and improvement for all conditions of human kind, and a higher life which would find its way into all states of suffering humanity, and open a source of happiness under suffering;—so it also taught, that a single life, where circumstances rendered it necessary, might be sanctified and ennobled by its relation to the kingdom of God, and become a peculiar means for the furtherance of that object.*

Thus Christianity had to maintain a conflict in the

* Compare Matthew xix. 11, 12, *Leben Jesu*, p. 567. If we think of the desolations that took place at the fall of the Roman Empire, and the national migrations,—how important was it for such times, that Christianity should allow a point of view from which a single life might be esteemed as a charism, though this point of view might be chosen owing to an ascetic bias. How important that that which was occasioned by the pressure of circumstances, should be made a means of blessing, (by the education of the rude nations effected by the monkish orders).—See the valuable remarks of F. v. Meyer, in his review of Olshausen's Commentary.

Corinthian church with two opposing one-sided tendencies of the moral sentiments,—the ascetic over-valuation of celibacy, and the tendency which would enforce marriage as an unconditional, universal law, without admitting that variety of the social relations, under which the kingdom of God was capable of exhibiting itself.

The first tendency certainly did not proceed from the Judaizing section of the church, for those apostles to whose authority the Petrine party specially appealed, were married; and took their wives with them on their missionary journeys; 1 Cor. ix. 5; besides, that such ascetism was totally foreign to their national manners. From the Hebrew standing-point a fruitful marriage appeared as a peculiar blessing and honour; while unmarried life, or a childless marriage, was esteemed a disgrace. Though by the feeling of sadness at the passing away of the glory of the ancient theocracy, and of dissatisfaction with the existing religion, and by the infusion of foreign oriental elements, ascetic tendencies were produced in the later Judaizers; still the spirit of the original Hebrew* system made itself felt, and counteracted to a certain extent the ascetic tendencies, both in Judaism and Christianity.† But among the Pauline party, an over-valuation of the single life more or less prevailed, and in this respect they thought themselves countenanced by the example of their apostle. The Judaizers, on the other hand, remained on the ancient Hebrew standing-point, as uncompromising opponents of celibacy.‡

* Hence also the ascetic tendency of the Essenes was corrected by a party who introduced marriage into this sect.

† This opposition appeared among the later descendants of the Judaizers of this age. Thus in the Clementines, it is given as the characteristic of a true prophet, *γαμοι νομιτιναι, ιγκραστιαν συγχωρεῖ*, *Hom. iii. § 16*. It is enjoined on the overseers of the church, § 68, *και μη μοινοι κατισπυγιστας τους γαμους, αλλα και των προβεβηκοσαν*. Epiphannus says of that class of Ebronites whom he describes, that they reject *παρθενια*; “*αναγκάζουσι δι και παρ’ ἡλικιαν ιγαμιζουσι τους νιους ἐξ ἱπιστροπῆς δῆδιν των παρ’ αυτοῖς διδασκαλων*.” Similar things are found in the religious books of the Zabians against monkery.

‡ When Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 40, recommends celibacy in

The opposition against the rigidity of Judaism, and that false liberalism which actuated many, disposed them to break through several wholesome moral restraints. It was maintained, and with justice, that Christianity had broken down the wall of separation between the sexes, in reference to the concerns of the higher life, and had freed woman from her state of servitude. But seduced by the spirit of false freedom, individuals had been led to overstep the limits prescribed by nature and sound morals, and rendered sacred by Christianity. Women, contrary to the customs prevalent among the Greeks,* appeared in the Christian assemblies unveiled, and, putting themselves on an equality with the men, assumed the office of public teachers.

The want of Christian love was also evinced by the disputes that arose respecting property, which the parties were not willing to decide, as had been hitherto customary in the Jewish and Christian churches, by arbitrators chosen from among themselves; these Gentile Christians, boastful of their freedom, set aside the scruples which restrained Jewish Christians, and appealed without hesitation to a heathen tribunal.

By this defect in the spirit of Christian love, those religious feasts which were particularly fitted to represent the loving communion of Christians and to maintain its vigour, lost their true significance, those Christian Agapæ, which composed one whole with the celebration of the Last Supper. At these love-feasts, the power of Christian fellowship was shewn in overcoming all the differences of rank and education; rich and poor, masters and slaves, partook with one another of the same simple meal.

certain cases, he appears to have in view the Judaizers, who set themselves against an apostolic authority; for in the words "*δοκῶ δε λέγειν πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν*," he appears to contradict those who believed and asserted that they alone had the Spirit of God.

* This appears to me the most simple and natural interpretation. What has been said by some respecting the difference of the Roman and Greek customs of *aperto* or *operto capite sacra facere*, seems hardly applicable here.

But in the Corinthian church, where these differences were so strongly marked, this could not be attained. There existed among the Greeks an ancient custom of holding entertainments at which each one brought his food with him, and consumed it alone.* The Agapæ in the Corinthian church were conducted on the plan of this ancient custom, although the peculiar object of the institution was so different; consequently, the distinction of rich and poor was rendered peculiarly prominent, and the rich sometimes indulged in excesses which desecrated the character of these meetings.

The predominant Grecian character and constitution of the Corinthian church, appeared in zeal for mutual communication by speaking in their public assemblies, and for the cultivation of those charisms which related to oral religious instruction; but it took a one-sided direction, which shewed its baneful influence at a later period in the Greek church, an aspiring rather after extraordinary powers of discourse, than after a life of eminent practical godliness.† This unpractical tendency, and the want of an all-animating and guiding love, were also shewn in their mode of valuing and applying the various kinds of charisms which related to public speaking; in their one-sided over-valuation of gifts they sought for the more striking and dazzling, such as speaking in new tongues, in preference to those that were more adapted to general edification.

To which of the parties in the Corinthian church, the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection belonged cannot be determined with certainty, since we have no precise account of their peculiar tenets. No other source

* See *Xenoph. Memorabil.* iii. 14. The *συμπόσιον φιλικόν* bore a greater resemblance to the Agapæ; at these feasts, all that each brought was made a part of a common meal, which the chronicler Johannes Malala mentions as continuing to be practised even in his time. See vii. Chronograph. e. collect. Niebuhr. p. 180.

† Paul reminds them in 1 Cor. iv. 20, that a participation in the kingdom of God is shewn not in high-sounding words, but in the power of the life.

of information is left open to us, than what we may infer from the objections against the doctrine of the resurrection which Paul seems to presuppose, and from the reasons alleged by him in its favour, and adapted to the standing-point from which they assailed it. As to the former, Paul might construct these objections, (as he had often done on other occasions when developing an important subject,) without our being authorized to infer that they were exactly the objections which had been urged by the impugnors of the doctrine. And as to the latter, in his mode of establishing the doctrine, he might follow the connection with other Christian truths in which this article of faith presented itself to his own mind, without being influenced by the peculiar mode of the opposition made to it.

When Paul, for example, adduced the evidence for the truth of the resurrection of Christ, this will not justify the inference, that his Corinthian opponents denied the resurrection of Christ; for, without regarding their opposition, he might adopt this line of argument, because to his own mind, faith in the resurrection of Christ was the foundation of faith in the resurrection of the redeemed. He generally joins together the doctrines of the resurrection and of immortality, and hence some may infer that his opponents generally denied personal immortality. But still it remains a question, whether Paul possessed exact information respecting the sentiments of these persons, or whether he did not follow the connection in which the truths of the Christian faith were presented to his own mind, and his habit of seeing in the opponents of the doctrines of the resurrection those also of the doctrine of immortality, since both stood or fell together in the Jewish polemical theology.

This controversy on the resurrection has been deduced from the ordinary opponents of that doctrine among the Jews, the Sadducees, and it has hence been concluded that it originated with the Judaizing party in the Corinthian church. This supposition appears to be confirmed by the circumstance that Paul particularly mentions, as witnesses for the truth of Christ's resurrection, Peter

and James, who were the most distinguished authorities of the Judaizing party; but this cannot be esteemed a proof, for he must on any supposition have laid special weight on the testimony of the apostles collectively, and of these in particular, for the appearance of Christ repeated to them after his resurrection. Had he thought of the Sadducees, he would have joined issue with them on their peculiar mode of reasoning from the alleged silence of the Pentateuch, just as Christ opposed the Sadducees from this standing-point. But we no where find an example of the mingling of Sadduceeism and Christianity, and as they present no points of connection with one another, such an amalgamation is in the highest degree improbable.

A similar reply must be made to those who imagine that the controversy on the doctrine of the resurrection, and the denial of that of immortality, may be explained from a mingling of the Epicurean notions with Christianity. Yet the passages in 1 Cor. xv. 32-35, may appear to be in favour of this view, if we consider the practical consequence deduced by Paul from that denial of the resurrection as a position laid down in the sense of the Epicureans, if we find in that passage a warning against their God-forgetting levity, and against the infectious example of the lax morals which were the offspring of their unbelief. Yet the objections would not apply with equal force to this interpretation as to the first.* From the delicacy and mobility of the Grecian character, so susceptible of all kinds of impressions, we can more easily imagine such a mixture of contradictory mental elements and such inconsistency, than from the stiffness of Jewish nationality, and the strict, dogmatic, decided nature of Sadduceeism. To this may be added, that the spirit of the times, so very much disposed to Eclecticism and Syncretism, tended to bring nearer one another and to amalgamate modes of thinking that, at a different period, would have stood in most di-

* As Baur correctly remarks in his Essay on the Christ-party, p. 81.

rect and violent opposition. Yet it would be difficult to find in Christianity, whether viewed on the doctrinal or ethical side, any thing which could attract a person who was devoted to the Epicurean philosophy, and induce him to include something Christian in his Syncretism, unless we think of something entirely without reference to all the remaining peculiarities of Christianity, relating only to the idea of a monotheistic universal religion, in opposition to the popular superstitions, and some moral ideas detached from their connection with the whole system; but this would be at least not very probable, and might more easily happen in an age when Christianity had long been fermenting in the general mind, rather than on its first appearance in the heathen world. All history, too, testifies against this supposition; for we always see the Epicurean philosophy in hostility to Christianity, and never in the first ages do we find any approximation of the two standing-points. As to the only passage which may appear to favour this view, 1 Cor. xv. 32-35, it is not clear that the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection had really brought forward the maxims here stated. It might be, that Paul here intended only to characterize that course of living which it appeared to him must proceed from the consistent carrying out of a philosophy that denied the distinction of man to eternal life; for the idea of eternal life and of the reality of a striving directed to eternal things were to him correlative ideas. And when persons who had made a profession of Christianity could fall into a denial of eternal life, it appeared to him as an infatuation of mind proceeding from *anaesthesia*, and hurrying a man away to sinful practice; a forgetfulness of God, or the mark of a state of estrangement from God, in which a man knows nothing of God. It is much more probable, that philosophically educated Gentile Christians were prejudiced against the doctrine of the resurrection from another standing-point, as in later times; the common rude conception of this doctrine which Paul particularly combated probably gave rise to many such prejudices. The objections, how can such a body as the present be united to the soul in a

higher condition, and how is it possible that a body which has sunk into corruption should be restored again; these objections would perfectly suit the standing-point of a Gentile Christian, who had received a certain philosophical training, although it cannot be affirmed with certainty, that precisely these objections were brought forward in the present instance. And if we are justified in supposing, that, by the Christ-party is meant one that, from certain expressions of Christ which they explained according to their subjective standing-point, constructed a peculiar philosophical Christianity, it would be most probable that such persons formed an idea of a resurrection only in a spiritual sense, and explained in this manner the expressions of Christ himself relating to the resurrection, as we must in any case assume that those who wished to be Christians and yet denied the future resurrection, were far removed from the true standard of Christian doctrine in other respects, and had indulged in arbitrary explanations of such of the discourses of Christ as they were acquainted with.

It may be asked, where, and in what manner did Paul receive the first accounts of these disturbances in the Corinthian church? From several expressions of Paul in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* it appears, that when he wrote his admonitory epistle, he had been there again, but only for a very short time, and that he must have had many painful experiences of the disorders among them, though they might not all have appeared during his visit.†

* Between which and the First Epistle, Paul could have taken no journey to Corinth, and yet in the First Epistle, as we shall presently see, there is a passage which must be most naturally referred to a preceding second journey to that city.

† I must now declare myself, after repeated examinations, more decidedly than in the first edition, in favour of the view maintained by Bleek in his valuable essay in the "Theologischen Studien und Kritiken," 1830, part iii., which has since been approved by Rückert,—by Schott, in his discussion of some important chronological points in the history of the apostle Paul, *Jena*, 1832,—and by Credner, in his *In-*

Owing to the breaks in the narrative of the Acts, it is difficult to decide, *when* this second visit to Corinth

troductio to the New Testament,—and by others. Though some of the passages adduced as evidence for this opinion admit of another interpretation, yet, taken altogether, they establish the second visit of Paul to this church as an undeniable fact. The passage in 2 Cor. xii. 14, compared with v. 18, we must naturally understand to mean, that, as he had already stayed twice at Corinth without receiving the means of support from the church, he was resolved so to act on his third visit, as to be no more a burden to them than on the two former occasions. If verse 14 be understood to mean (a sense of which the words will admit), that he was planning to come to them a third time, we must supply what is not expressly said, that he would certainly execute this resolution, and yet the words so understood do not quite suit the connection. According to the most approved reading of 2 Cor. ii. 1, the *καὶ* must be referred to the whole clause *ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς ἰδοὺς*, and then it follows, that Paul had already *once* received a painful impression from the Corinthians in a visit made to them, which cannot refer to his first residence among them, and therefore obliges us to suppose a second already past. In the passage 2 Cor. xii. 21, which cannot here be brought in proof, it is indeed possible, and, according to the position of the words, is most natural, to connect the *καὶ* with *ἰδοὺς*; but we may be allowed to suppose that the *καὶ* belongs to *ταπεινωθήσεται*, but is placed first for emphasis. In this case, the introduction of the *καὶ*, which yet is not added to *ἰδοὺς* in v. 20, as well as the position of the whole clause *καὶ ἰδοὺς*, is made good, and the connection with what follows favours this interpretation. Paul, in v. 21, expresses his anxiety lest God should humble him a second time among them when he came. Accordingly, we should thus understand xiii. 1, following the simplest interpretation, though this passage may be otherwise understood, (if it be supposed to mean, that as he had already twice announced his intended coming to Corinth, having now a third time repeated his threatening, he would certainly execute it). “I am now intending for a third time to come to you, and as what is supported by two or three witnesses must be valid, so now what I have threatened a second and a third time, will certainly be fulfilled. I have (when I was with you a second time) told beforehand, those who had sinned, and all the rest, and I now say it to them a second time, as if I were with you—though I now (this *now* is opposed to formerly,

took place. If the Second Epistle to the Corinthians had not been addressed at the same time to the churches in Achaia, we might suppose that Paul, during his long residence at Corinth, had taken missionary or visitation journeys throughout other parts of Achaia, and that he then once more returned to Corinth, only for a short time, in order to fetch Aquila for the journeys he had in prospect. It appears that on this journey he was exposed to many dangers, and that on his deliverance from them he made the vow mentioned above. But since the second epistle was also directed to the churches in Achaia, this supposition, in order to be maintained, must be so modified, that Paul could have made in the mean time another longer journey, and returned back again to Achaia—which it is not easy to admit. Or we must suppose, that during his longer residence at Ephesus, of which we are now speaking, he undertook another missionary journey, and called in passing at Corinth ; or

since when present among them, he had expressed the same sentiments,) that if I come to you again, I will not act towards you with forbearance, (as Paul, when he came to them a second time, still behaved with forbearance, though he had already sufficient cause for dissatisfaction with them). De Wette, indeed, objects against this interpretation, that the mention of the first visit of Paul to Corinth would be in this case quite superfluous ; but if, during his second visit, he had not acted with severity towards the Corinthians, but intended to do so on this third occasion, because they had not listened to his admonitions, he would have reason to mention his two first visits together, in order to mark more distinctly in what respect the third would be distinguished from the other two. And though, during his first residence among them, his experience was on the whole pleasing, yet in this long period many things must have happened with which he could not be satisfied, but which he treated gently, trusting to the future progress of their Christian life. We may find in the first epistle, a trace of this his second residence at Corinth. When in 1 Cor. xvi. 7, Paul says, that he intended not now to see them by the way, ἀπὸ τοῦ δρόμου, and its position allows us to assume a reference to an earlier visit, which he made only “by the way,” ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ δρόμου, and as this was so very transient, we may account for his making no further allusions to it in the first epistle.

that, by the anxiety which the news brought from Corinth excited in his mind, he was induced to go thither from Ephesus, but on account of circumstances which called him back to Ephesus, he could stay only a short time with the Corinthian church, and therefore gave them notice of a longer residence among them. But it does not well agree with this last supposition, that Paul distinguishes this visit as one that took place "by the way." And especially if it took place not long before the first epistle, we might the more expect allusions to it in that. The communications between Paul and the Corinthian church seem also to presuppose, that he had not been with them for a considerable time. There remains only a third supposition, that the visitation which he made after his departure from Antioch to the churches earlier founded by him (Acts xviii. 23) before he entered on a fresh field of labour, was of greater extent than is distinctly stated in that passage, and that it extended as far as Achaia. Perhaps he then travelled first from Phrygia towards the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and then sailed to Hellas. Possibly he then found at Corinth Apollos who had proceeded thither, when Paul coming from Antioch, passed through the upper parts of Asia (Acts xix. 1),* and perhaps joined him on his return, and went with him to Ephesus.

We must therefore at all events suppose, that Paul had obtained his first knowledge of the alteration for the worse in the Corinthian church by his own observation. He could not indeed have witnessed the strife of the various parties, for, as appears from 1 Cor. xi. 12, he heard of this first at Ephesus from the report of strangers. But already he must have had the painful experience, that in a church which once was inspired with so much Christian zeal, their old vices and enormities again appeared under a Christian guise. He admonished them

* We must in this instance interpolate Paul's journey to Corinth, Acts xix. 1, and suppose, that since the author of the Acts knew nothing of the wider extent of Paul's visitation at that time, he represented that he immediately betook himself from Upper Asia to Ephesus.

for their improvement, and threatened to use severer measures, if, when he returned from Ephesus, he should find that no improvement had taken place. At Ephesus, he could obtain information respecting the effect of his last admonitions on the church.

But he received worse news than he expected of the corruption of morals in the Corinthian church, and especially of the vicious conduct of an individual who had maintained unlawful intercourse with his step-mother. Hence, in an epistle* he addressed to the Corinthian church, he reproached them with allowing such a man still to remain among them, and required them to renounce all connection with so abandoned a character.†

* The epistle in which Paul wrote this could not at any rate be that still retained by the Armenian church, which treats of subjects entirely different, and must be an answer to an earlier Epistle to the Corinthians. This pretended Epistle to the Corinthians by Paul, and their answer, bear on them, as is now universally acknowledged, the most undeniable marks of spuriousness. The account of the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection at Corinth, who were thought similar to later deniers of it among the Gentiles, connected with the tales of Simon Magus, and the account of the Jewish founders of sects, by Hegesippus, gave an idle monk the inducement to put together these fragments of Pauline phrases. If they were quoted in a genuine homily of Gregory *Thaumaturgus*, they were perhaps in existence in the 3d century, but this address of Gregory to the newly baptized may itself be supposititious.

† It may be asked, whether Paul in the last epistle treated merely of the case which was immediately under consideration in the Corinthian church, only of abstaining from intercourse with *σερβας*, or whether he expressly spoke of such who had fallen into other notorious vices;—the covetous, who had no regard for the property of others; the slanderous, those addicted to drinking, those who took any part whatever in the worship of idols. The manner in which he expresses himself in 1 Cor. v. 9–11, might signify, though not decisively, that since he was obliged to guard his words against misapprehension, he took advantage of this opportunity, to give a wider application to the principles they expressed, which he certainly had from the beginning in his mind, yet had not occasion to mention in his first epistle, which bore no one particular point. At all events, it is important to know how far Paul extended the strictness of church discipline,

It was indeed sufficiently evident, what Paul here intended, that the Corinthians should not only exclude from the meetings of the church those who called themselves Christians, but denied Christianity by their vicious lives ; but also abstain from all kind of intercourse with them, in order to testify emphatically that such a merely outward profession was of no value, to bring these persons to a sense of their guilt, and to declare practically to the heathen world, that whoever did not exemplify the Christian doctrine in the conduct of his life, must not flatter himself that he was a Christian. But since Paul had not thought it necessary to add, that he spoke only of the vicious in the church, and not of all persons in general who lived in such vices, the Corinthians did not think of the limitation which the thing itself might easily have suggested, and thus they were thrown into perplexity, how to comply with such an injunction, for how could they, while living in the midst of an evil world, renounce all intercourse with the vicious ? They addressed a letter to the apostle, in which they stated their perplexity, and proposed several other questions on doubtful cases in the concerns of the church.

By means of this letter, and the messengers who brought it, he obtained a more complete knowledge of the concerns and state of the church. In the communication which contained his reply to the questions proposed, he poured forth his whole heart full of paternal love to the church, and entered minutely into all the necessities of their situation. This epistle, a master-piece of apostolic wisdom in church government, contains much that was important in reference to the change produced by Christianity on the various relations of life. It was probably conveyed by the messengers on their return to Corinth.

Paul condemned in an equal degree all party feeling in the Corinthian church ; his salutation in verse 2, was opposed to it, and suited to remind all that they equally belonged to one church, which composed all the faithful and redeemed. He taught them that Christ was their sole head, to whom they must all adhere—that all hu-

man labourers were to be considered only as instruments by each of whom God worked according to the peculiar standing-point on which God had placed him, in order to promote in the hearts of their fellow-men a work which they were all destined to serve. They ought to be far from venturing to boast that they had this or that man for their teacher—for such boasting, by which they owned themselves dependent on man, was rather a denial of their being Christians; for if they only, as became Christians, referred every thing to Christ, to whom they were indebted for communion with God, they might view all things as designed to serve them, and as belonging to them; those sublime expressions in 1 Cor. iii. 21, shew how the truest spiritual freedom and the highest elevation of soul are the offspring of Christian humility. This general truth in reference to the manner in which all Christian teachers (each according to his peculiar qualifications) were to be estimated and made use of, he applies particularly to his relation to Apollos; of whom he could speak most reservedly and unsuspectedly, since he was a man with whom he stood in the closest connection, and who had adopted his own peculiar form of doctrine. To those persons who could not find in his simple preaching the wisdom which they sought after, and preferred Apollos as a teacher, more according to their Grecian taste,* he said, that it was wrong on their part to regret the absence of such wisdom in his preaching, for the fountain of all genuine wisdom, the wisdom of God, was not to be found in any scheme of philosophy, but only in the doctrine of the Crucified Jesus, the Saviour of the world, which he had made the central point of his preaching, but this divine wisdom could only be found and understood by a disposition that was susceptible of what was divine. For this reason, he had never yet

* We have already spoken of the reference of this whole section, 1 Cor. i. 1-18. We need not enter more at large into the dispute respecting the meaning proposed by Eichorn and others—that Paul here directed his argumentation against Grecian Sophists, who had made an entrance into the church, and threatened to seduce many into unbelief.

been able to lead them by his discourses to perceive in the simple doctrine of the gospel, (which in the eyes of the world was foolishness,) the depths of divine wisdom, because an ungodlike disposition predominated in their minds, of which these party strifes were an evident sign. He gave the Corinthians a rule by which they might pass a judgment on all teachers of Christianity. Whoever acknowledged the immoveable foundation of the Christian life, which had been laid by himself, that Jesus was the Saviour, that men were indebted for salvation to him alone, and on this foundation proceeded to erect the Christian doctrine, would thereby prove himself to be a Christian teacher, and by his faith in Him who alone could impart salvation, would attain it himself, and lead others to it. But in the structure of doctrine which was raised on this foundation, the divine might more or less be mixed with the human, and so far be deteriorated. The complete purifying process, the separation of the divine and the human, would be left to the last judgment. Many a one who had attached too great value to the human, would see the work destroyed, which he had constructed, though the foundation on which it rested would remain for himself and others: such a one would be saved after many severe trials, which he must undergo for purification, from the alloy of self; 1 Cor. iii. 11-15.* But from the teachers who adhered to the unchangeable foundation of God's kingdom, and built upon it, either with better or worse

* Since the whole passage which speaks of fire, of the building constructed of various materials, some fire-proof and others destructible by fire, and of being saved as from the midst of the fire, is composed of images, and is figurative throughout,—it is very illogical, as Origen has justly remarked, arbitrarily to detach from the rest, and take in a literal sense a single trait in the picture as that of fire. Nor let any one say that the idea of such a judgment in the historical development is somewhat unapauline. The idea of such a judgment connected with the publication of the gospel, and accompanying its operations, pervades the whole New Testament,—by which indeed, a final judgment of the world, to which this is only preparative, is not excluded.

materials, Paul distinguishes those of whom he says, that they destroy the Temple of God itself in believers, and are guilty of peculiar sacrilege; against such he denounced the most awful punishment, "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy;" 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.

It is worthy of notice, that where Paul treats of eating meat offered to idols, he does not, in order to impress the Gentile-Christians with their obligations to abstain from all such food,—appeal to the decision of the apostolic convention at Jerusalem, any more than he opposed the authority of that decision to the Jewish-Christians, who wished to compel the Gentiles to be circumcised. It is one of the characteristics of his method, that he here rests his argument, not on outward positive command, a *requis*, but on the inward law in the hearts of believers, on what the spirit of the gospel requires. As in the instance of those who wished to impose the law of circumcision on Gentile Christians, instead of appealing to an outward authority, he pointed out the internal contrariety of their conduct to the peculiar and fundamental principles of the gospel; so on this point he opposed to the abuse of Christian freedom, the law of love which was inseparable from the gospel. In short, it appears that, though the authority of that decision was held sacred in Palestine, Acts xxi. 25, yet beyond these limits it seems to have been little regarded. Since that decision rested on mutual concessions, it followed that if one of the parties of the Jewish Christians failed to fulfil the condition—if they would not acknowledge the uncircumcised as their heathen brethren,—then, on the other side, the obligation ceased to operate on the Gentile Christians, who by the observance of that decision, would have made an approach to the Jewish Christians. At a later period, after the settlement of the opposition between these two hostile tendencies could no longer be accomplished, but a Jewish element gained entrance into the church itself in an altered form, this decision might again acquire the strict power of law.

Paul did not dispute the position which the free-think-

ing Christians at Corinth were always contending for, that no law could be laid down about outward things that were in themselves indifferent; he did not even exact their deference to the apostolic decision, by which such food was absolutely forbidden, but he shews them from the standing-point of the gospel, that what is in itself lawful, may, under special circumstances, cease to be so, as far as it contradicts the law of love,—the obligation of Christians to act on all occasions so that the salvation of others may be most promoted, and the glory of God be subserved. He points out that they even denied their own Christian freedom, since in another way they brought themselves into subjection to outward things, which they ought to have used with freedom in the spirit of love, according as circumstances might vary.*

In reference to the question proposed to him respecting a single life, he took a middle course between the two contending parties, those who entirely condemned a single life, and those who wished to prescribe it for all persons as something essential to Christian perfection. Though by his own peculiar character he might be disposed to attach a higher value to a single life, (which for his own method of labouring was certainly an important assistance), than could be ascribed to it from the Christian standing-point, when viewed only objectively; yet the power of a higher spirit was here more clearly manifested, by which, though his own subjective inclination was not denied, in the regulation of his own conduct, yet it was not allowed to interfere injuriously with his views of Christian morals, and with his wisdom in the guidance of the church; but how could it be otherwise with a man who, although as a man he retained a strongly marked individuality, was influenced in so extraordinary a degree by the Spirit of Christ, of that Saviour for whom he had suffered the loss of all things! He discerned how inju-

* 1 Cor. vi. 12. *παντα μοι ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιάζομαι ὑπο τινος*. If every thing is lawful for me, yet I must not allow myself to be governed by external things, as if, because I can use them, I must necessarily use them.

rious a forced celibacy would be in a church like the Corinthian, and hence sought to guard against this evil. He represented a single life for those who were fitted for it by their natural constitution, as a means of attending with less distraction to the concerns of the kingdom of God, without being diverted from them by earthly cares, especially under the great impending tribulations, until the second coming of Christ, from which we must infer what an influence the near approach of that event had on his own course of conduct. He placed the essence of Christian perfection not in celibacy, nor in the outward denial of earthly things; but in that renunciation of the world which has its seat in the disposition, which would make the married and the rich, as well as the unmarried and the poor, ready to sacrifice every thing which the exigencies of the times might demand; to suffer the loss of all things, however dear to their hearts, for the sake of the gospel; 1 Cor. vii. 30.

In speaking of the various relations of life, in which men might be placed at the time of their conversion, Paul lays down as a rule, that that event should produce no change in this respect. Christianity did not violently dissolve the relation in which a man found himself placed by birth, education, and the leading of divine Providence, but taught him to act in them from a new point of view, and with a new disposition. It effected no abrupt revolutions, but gradually, by the power of the Spirit working from within, made all things new. The apostle applies this especially to the case of slaves, which it was more needful to consider, because from the beginning that gospel which was preached to the poor found much acceptance among this class, and the knowledge imparted to them by Christianity of the common dignity and rights of all men, might easily have excited them to throw off their earthly yoke. Likewise in this view, Christianity, in order not to mingle worldly and spiritual things together, and not to miss its main object, the salvation of the soul, did not presume to effect by force a sudden revolution in their condition, but operated only on the mind and disposition. To slaves the gospel presented a

higher life, which exalted them above the restraints of their earthly relation; and though masters were not required by the apostles to give their slaves freedom, since it was foreign to their ministry to interfere with the arrangement of civil relations, yet Christianity imparted to masters such a knowledge of their duties to their slaves, and such dispositions towards them, and taught them to recognise as brethren the Christians among their slaves, in such a manner as to make their relation to them quite a different thing.

Paul, therefore, when he touches on this relation, tells the slave, that though by the arrangement of Providence he was debarred from the enjoyment of outward freedom, he should not be troubled, but rejoice that the Lord had bestowed upon him true inward freedom. But while he considers the latter as the only true freedom, in the possession of which man may be free under all outward restraints, and apart from which no true freedom can exist, he is very far from overlooking the subordinate worth of civil freedom, for he says to the slave, to whom he had announced the true, the spiritual freedom, "but if thou mayst be free, use it rather," 1 Cor. vii. 21,* which im-

* The later ascetic spirit forms a striking contrast on this point to the spirit of primitive Christianity. Although, in a grammatical view, it is most natural to supply the *ἐλευθερίας* which immediately precedes, or *ἐλευθερίας*, yet the latter Fathers have not thus understood it, because the worth of civil freedom appeared to them not so great, but they took the apostle's meaning to be exactly opposite, *μᾶλλον χρεῖσαι τῇ δουλείᾳ*. What De Wette has lately urged against this interpretation, does not appear to me convincing. The *οὐκ* (he thinks) is against it; but it suits very well. The apostle says, If called, being a slave to Christianity, thou shouldst be content. Christian freedom will not be injured by slavery—but yet, if thou canst be free (as a still additional good, which if thou dost not attain, be satisfied without it; but which, if offered to thee, is not to be despised) therefore make use of this opportunity of becoming free, rather than by neglecting it to remain a slave. The connection with v. 22, is not against it, if we recollect, that the clause beginning with *ἀλλὰ* is only a secondary or qualifying assertion, which certainly does not belong to the leading thought,

plies that the apostle viewed the state of freedom as more corresponding to the Christian calling, and that Christianity, when it so far gained the ascendancy as to form anew the social relations of mankind, would bring about this change of state, which he declares to be an object of preference.*

The Corinthian church had probably requested that Apollos might visit them again, and Paul acknowledged him as a faithful teacher, who had built on the foundation of the faith which he had laid, who had watered the field that he had planted. He was far from opposing

a mode of construction, similar to what we find elsewhere in Paul's writings.

* To this also the words in v. 23 may relate. "Ye are bought with a price (ye are made free from the dominion of Satan and sin), become not the slaves of men." Thus it would be understood by many. Christians ought not voluntarily, merely to escape from some earthly trouble, to put themselves in a condition which is not suited to their Christian calling. But since the apostle previously, when speaking of such relations as could only concern individuals in the church, used the singular, but now changed his style to the plural, it is hence probable, that he is speaking of a relation of a general kind, that is, giving an exhortation which would apply to all the Corinthians,—an exhortation, indeed, which is not so closely connected with what is said in v. 22, but to which he might easily have been led to make from the idea of a *δούλος χριστου*, so familiar and interesting to his mind, an idea that would equally apply to both bond and free; "Refuse not this true freedom which belongs to you as the bondsmen of Christ, do not become by a spiritual dependence the slaves of men, from being the bondsmen of Christ;"—an exhortation which was adapted in many respects to the condition of the Corinthian church; and this warning against a servitude totally incompatible with being a servant (or bondsman) of Christ, (which could not be asserted of a state of outward servitude, or slavery, simply as such) this warning would be a very suitable conclusion to the whole train of thought on inward and outward freedom. It was needless for him to notice the case of a person selling himself for a slave, since it was one that could hardly occur among Christians. Verse 24 is rather for than against this interpretation; for since v. 23 does not refer to outward relations, he once more repeats the injunction respecting them.

this request; he even requested Apollos to comply with it, but Apollos was resolved not to visit Corinth immediately. The importance attached to his person, and the efforts that had been made to place him at the head of a party, perhaps led him to this determination.

Paul wrote our First Epistle to the Corinthians about the time of the Jewish Passover, as appears from the allusion in v. 7. He had then the intention of staying at Ephesus till Pentecost; he informed them that many opportunities offered for publishing the gospel, but that he had also many enemies to contend with. He spoke of his being in daily peril of losing his life; 1 Cor. xv. 30.*

At the time of his writing this Epistle to Corinth, he had formed an extensive plan for his future labours. As during his stay of several years in Achaia and at Ephesus, he had laid a sufficient foundation for the extension

* Schrader infers from the words in 1 Cor. xvi. 8, that Paul could not have written this epistle at the close of his long residence at Ephesus, but at the beginning of another short stay there; for otherwise he must have said, *ἵνα μὴ ὁ δὲ ἐν Ἐφεσῷ ἴσῃ*, and could not have hoped to effect that in a few weeks for the spread of the gospel, and the counteraction of false teachers, which he could not accomplish even after several years. But we do not see why Paul, merely having the future in his eye and not reflecting on the past, might not leave out the *ἴσῃ*, as similar omissions frequently occur in an epistolary writing; and even if Paul in the course of a long time had effected much for the spread of the gospel, still he could say, since the sphere of his labours in Lesser Asia was continually extending, that "a great and effectual door" was opened for publishing the gospel. But the *ἀντιπαραστήσαντες* in this passage, which relates to the publication of the gospel, are certainly not false teachers, but open adversaries of Christianity. As the opportunities for making known the gospel were manifold, so also its enemies were many. This, therefore, does not contradict the preceding longer evidence of the apostle, but rather confirms it; for the most violent attacks on the preachers of the gospel, if they did not proceed from the Jews, would first arise, after by their long continued labours they had produced effects which threatened to injure the interests of many whose gains were derived from idolatrous practices.

of the Christian church among the nations who used the Greek language, he now wished to transfer his ministry to the West; and as it was his fundamental principle to make those regions the scene of his activity where no one had laboured before him—he wished on that account to visit Rome, the metropolis of the world, where a Church had long since been established, in his way to Spain,* and then to commence the publication of the gospel at the extremity of Western Europe. But before putting this plan into execution, he wished to obtain a munificent collection in the churches of the Gentile Christians for their poor believing brethren at Jerusalem, and to bring the amount himself to Jerusalem accompanied by some members of the churches. Already some time before he dispatched this Epistle to the Corinthians, he had sent Timothy and some others to Macedonia and Achaia to forward this collection, and to counterwork the dis-

* Rom. xv. 24, 28. Dr Baur, in his Essay on the Object and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans, in the "*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*," 1836, part iii. p. 156, has attempted to shew that Paul could not have written these words. He thinks that he discovers in them the marks of another hand, of which, in my opinion, no trace whatever can be found,—all appears wholly Pauline. It might indeed seem strange, that the apostle of the Gentiles had not yet visited the metropolis of the Gentile world. Accordingly, he gives an account of the causes which had hitherto prevented him, and expresses his earnest desire to become personally acquainted with the church of the metropolis. Since it was most important, first of all, to lay a foundation every where for the publication of the gospel, on which the superstructure might afterwards be easily raised, so it was his maxim—the same which he expresses in 2 Cor. x. 16, and which we see him always acting upon—to labour only in those regions where no one before had published the gospel. But among the Gentiles at Rome a church had been long founded, and hence he could not be justified on his own principles in leaving a field of labour in which there was still so much to be done, in order to visit a church that had been long established, and was in a state of progressive development. The difficulties which Baur finds in this passage are only created by a false interpretation.

turbing influences in the Corinthian church.* He hoped to receive through him an account of the impression which his epistle had made. But he found himself deceived in his expectations, for Timothy was probably prevented from travelling as far as Corinth, and came back to Ephesus without bringing the information which the apostle expected.† The apostle, animated by a tender paternal anxiety for the church, became uneasy respecting the effect produced by his epistle; he, therefore, sent Titus to Corinth for the purpose of obtaining information, and that he might personally operate on the church in accordance with the impression made by the epistle. As Paul had resolved, on sending away Titus, to leave Ephesus soon, he agreed with him to meet at Tröas, where he designed to make a longer stay in order to found a church, 2 Cor. ii. 12, and perhaps intended to shape his future

* 1 Cor. iv. 17. The manner in which Paul mentions Timothy both here and in xvi. 10, plainly shews that he was not the bearer of this epistle, and the latter passage makes it not improbable that Paul expected he would arrive at Corinth after his epistle, which would naturally happen though Timothy departed first, because he was detained a considerable time in Macedonia. Perhaps the messengers from the Corinthian church were already come to Ephesus when Timothy was going away, and as Paul wished to give them a copious reply, on that account he sent no epistle by Timothy.

† It favours the supposition that Timothy did not come as far as Corinth, that, in Acts xix. 22, only Macedonia is mentioned as the object of his mission. And if he came to Corinth as Paul's delegate, he would have mentioned him, as Rückert justly remarks, in connection with others who were sent by him; for though we are not justified that Paul here mentioned by name all who were sent by him to Corinth, yet the object for which he named them in order to appeal to the fact that they had acted with the same disposition as himself, and were as little burdensome to the Corinthian church, required the mention of a man like Timothy so closely connected with him, if he had stayed at Corinth as his delegate. This therefore is opposed to Bleek's view, which we shall afterwards mention, according to which Timothy really came to Corinth, and must have been the bearer of bad news from thence.

course by the information which he would there receive from Titus.

But here the question arises, could Paul have sent Titus to Corinth without an epistle? And if we find in his second Epistle to the Corinthians numerous allusions to an epistle which he simply designates as *the* epistle, shall we not most naturally conclude that it means an epistle sent by Titus? And so much the more, if these allusions contain many things that do not tally with the First Epistle to the Corinthians.* We ask then, in this second Epistle are such things really found which lead us to suppose another document composed in a different tone from the first epistle now extant? Let us examine this more closely. Paul says at the beginning of the second chapter that he had altered his former plan of travelling immediately from Ephesus to Corinth, and had resolved to go first to Macedonia, in order that he might not be obliged to produce a painful impression among them, if he came to them while the evils which he censured in his first epistle were still in existence. On this account, he wished, instead of coming immediately from Ephesus to Corinth, rather to communicate by letter what was painful to them, (which may very well refer to the reprehensions contained in the first epistle), and to await its operation in producing repentance, before he came to them in person. He says of the epistle in question, that he had written it in great anguish of heart and with many tears, for his object had been not to give them pain, but to evince his love for them. Does not

* Bleek has endeavoured to prove all this in his valuable essay already mentioned in the "*Studien und Kritiken*," 1830 part iii. But this is connected with the assumption that Timothy really came to Corinth, and the bad news which he brought influenced Paul to send Titus thither. If we only assume that Paul was informed that a part of the church had shewn themselves more haughty after the receipt of that first Epistle, it can be explained how he was induced to send a severer Epistle by Titus. But we have noticed above, what opposes the supposition that Timothy at that time really extended his journey as far as Corinth.

that suit such passages as 1 Cor. iv. 8-19; vi. 7; x. ? Does not that which he here says of his disposition correctly describe that state of mind, in which the news respecting the dangerous condition of the Corinthian church must have placed him ? It can well be referred to that individual who lived in unlawful intercourse with his step-mother, against whose continuance in church-fellowship he had so strongly expressed himself, when he says of such a one that he troubled not only himself as the founder of the church, but in a certain degree the whole church. That epistle was indeed suited to call forth in the Corinthians the consciousness of their corrupt state, that sorrow which leads to salvation, as Paul says of that epistle, 2 Cor. vii. 9, &c. But chiefly we might be induced, by verse 12 of the same chapter, to suppose a reference to what was said by Paul in an epistle now lost : " He had written such a letter to them, not on his account who had done the wrong, nor on his account against whom it was done, but from a regard to all that his sincere zeal for their best welfare might be manifest."* If we refer

* It will be proper here to determine the correct reading. If we adopt the reading received by Lachmann, "*ἐν σπουδῇ ὑμῶν ἐν ὁσῷ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*," it will favour that interpretation, according to which there must be a reference to a personal wrong directed against the apostle. The connection may be traced in this manner. If I have written to you in this manner (using such strong language), it is not on account of him who has committed the wrong, nor on his account who has suffered the wrong (Paul himself who had been personally injured by the insolence of that man), but that your zeal for me might be made known by you before God (i. e. in an upright manner, so that the disposition in which you act, may prove itself in the sight of God, as that of true love). This would be the contrast : I did it not, to avenge my apostolic authority, and to punish the person who impugned it; but on this account, to give you an opportunity to manifest your zeal for me, as it has now been actually shewn. But still we must agree with Rückert that the *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* according to this reading seems rather superfluous. This *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* certainly intimates, that it was Paul's wish to speak of his zeal for the welfare of the church, which would be shewn in his conduct towards it; also in the words *ἵνα ἴσῃτε τὸν θεόν*, we find such an indi-

the words to our first epistle, it is difficult to determine who the person can be *against* whom the wrong was committed. All will be clear, if we refer it to Paul himself, that he intended delicately to point out himself as the injured party; and that he had been induced thus to write, not from a selfish interest, but from a sincere zeal for their best welfare. It also appears to be implied that the epistle in question related principally if not entirely to this one case. But the affair of the incestuous person occupies only a very small space in the first epistle. All this rather favours the supposition that there was another epistle of Paul, not now extant, which related exclusively or principally to the conduct of one individual who had conducted himself towards the apostle with great insolence, either the same immoral person on whom Paul passes his judgment in the first epistle, or another. Yet this conjecture does not seem to rest on a very solid foundation, for in these words we find no further mark which can lead us to suppose a personal reference to the apostle. He who was fond of contrasts and accustomed to mark them strongly, would on this occasion have marked very strongly the contrast between his personal interest, and the interest of the church, if he had wished to express any thing of the kind. On the other hand, we may fairly understand by the person against whom the wrong was committed, the father, whom his son by his incestuous conduct had so grievously injured; whether the father was already dead or still living, which on this supposition would be more probable.* Perhaps the complaints of the father had been the occasion of making

cation that Paul was speaking of his own disposition as shewing itself to be upright before God. The correctness of the common reading is also established by comparing it with 2 Cor. ii. 4, for the words *τῆς σκανδαλίου ἡμῶν τῆς ὑπερ ὑμῶν*, correspond to the words *τῆς ἀγαστρῆς*, &c. But it may be easily explained how looking back to vii. 11 and 7, would give rise to a various reading.

* It is singular, that in the first epistle, no mention is made of the father of the offender.

known the whole affair to the apostle.* The meaning of the passage would then be, that they ought not to believe that a reference to any individual whatever, that resentment against any person, or attachment to any one, had moved him thus to write, but that he had been actuated chiefly by a concern for the welfare of the church. Nor is it necessary to assume, that the whole of the epistle to which he here alludes, was occupied with this one affair, if only his readers can infer from the connection that he here wishes to speak of this one object (among several others) of the epistle.

The manner also in which Paul speaks of the sending away of Titus, contains no such marks which justify the supposition that this step was occasioned by the unfavourable account brought by Timothy of the state of the Corinthian church; for he declares in 2 Cor. vii. 14, that on his leaving he said many things to him in the praise of that church, and hence had raised good expectations respecting it in his mind.† Still the objection may be urged, Titus must at all events, as a messenger from Paul, have brought with him an epistle to Corinth; and if Paul quotes a letter without marking it more precisely, we can understand by it no other than the last, and therefore

* All difficulties would vanish, if with Daniel Heinsius, we understand the words "*τὸν ἀδελφεόν*," as neuter = *τὸ ἀγαπῶν*, which the New Testament use of *ἀδελφός* would allow. The transition from the masculine to the neuter may surprise us less, since the neuter follows immediately after. The *ἀδελφός* would then correspond to the *πρῶτος* before mentioned. And though it may appear objectionable that Paul should so express himself as if such a sin was a thing of minor importance, yet this is not an idea conveyed by the words; but he wishes only to express very strongly in an antithetical form, that his anxiety for the welfare of the whole church, for the preservation of its purity, had induced him so to write. But it suits the contrast still better, if all personal references were kept out of sight.

† The words in 2 Cor. vii. 14, I cannot understand according to the mutual relation of the clauses otherwise than thus: By what I have said to Titus in your praise, I have not been put to shame; but as I have spoken to you all according to truth, so also this has been proved to be true.

the one brought by Titus. But if he sent Titus after Timothy's return, and soon after he had dispatched his first Epistle to the Corinthian church, we may more readily presume that he would not think it necessary to send a long epistle at the same time, but perhaps give him only a few lines in which he intimated that Titus was to supply the place of Timothy, who was not able to come to them himself.*

* A difficulty is here presented, from the manner in which Paul mentions the sending of Titus in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. 2 Cor. viii. 6, compared with v. 16, and ix. 3; xii. 18. Billroth and Rückert (who does not however assent to all the reasons alleged by the former) have hence concluded, that the sending of Titus was by no means after the dispatch of that first epistle, but took place long before, and that the arrangement of the collection was the object of his visit. But Titus would be still at Corinth when that letter arrived, and hence could communicate to Paul respecting the effect it produced. Perhaps Titus was the bearer of the first lost epistle to the Corinthian church. Hence it may be explained, why Paul could consider his second epistle (the first now extant) as his last written epistle, and quote it without any further designation. But if this had been the case, we must necessarily look for an express mention of Titus in our first epistle; and since none such occurs, we must either assume that the sending of Titus mentioned in the second epistle, is the same as that which we have spoken of in the text, or if we consider it as different, it occurred much earlier, so that Titus, when Paul wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians, must have been a long while returned to them. And for this latter assumption, it may be urged, that at that first sending a companion of Titus is mentioned; and, on the other hand, when Paul mentions his meeting with Titus in Macedonia, no one else appears; not that this is a decisive proof, because Titus alone might be mentioned as being the principal person. But, on the contrary, when Paul states that he boasted of the Corinthian church to Titus, it seems implied (if not absolutely necessary) that this church was not personally known to him. If we are disposed to assume, that this mission of Titus was the same as that mentioned in the first epistle, the chronological order of events would not oppose this supposition. But first, there is the question, whether Paul reckoned the year according to the Roman, Greek, or Jewish Calendar; in the last case, he might men-

But after the sending of Titus, a violent popular tumult arose at Ephesus against the apostle, which was nevertheless an evidence of the great success of his ministry in Lesser Asia. Small models in gold and silver of the famed temple of Artemis were used to be made,* which being sent to distant parts as an object of devotion, brought great gain to the city. A man named Demetrius, who had a large manufactory of such models, and a great number of workmen, began to fear, since the gospel had spread with such success in Lesser Asia, and faith in Artemis had so far declined† as to lessen the sale of his wares in this region, that the gains of his trade would soon be lost. He assembled his numerous workmen, and easily inflamed their anger against the enemies of their gods, who threatened to deprive the great Artemis of her honour, and them of their gain. A great tumult arose, they all hastened to the public place where they were wont to assemble, and many

tion the sending of Titus as having taken place in the preceding year, if it was before Easter; in the second, if it was after Easter, and if he wrote this epistle in autumn. But it is not at all necessary to assume that the sending away of Titus was in the preceding year; for it might be the case that the Corinthian church had begun the collection, before Titus had proposed it to them. Nor ought it to excite our surprise, that Paul mentions only one object for which he sent Titus the arrangement of the collection, for he might be sent for this purpose, and at the same time, to obtain information for Paul respecting the state of the Corinthian church, and the effect produced by his epistle. But as he was writing respecting the collection, he had no occasion to advert to another topic.

* The words of Paul, Acts xx. 19, perhaps intimate, that this popular disturbance proceeded from the machinations of the Jews, though it afterwards threatened to be dangerous to the Jews themselves.

† It is possible, that the successful ministry of Paul already threatened the destruction of idolatry, though after the first successful propagation of the gospel, a pause in its progress intervened, similar to what has often occurred. Compare Pliny's account of the decline of heathenism, in my church history, vol. i. p. 140.

cried out, some one thing, some another, without knowing why they were come together. As the Jews here lived in the midst of a numerous Greek population who viewed them with constant aversion, any special occasion easily roused their slumbering prejudices into open violence, and they had then much to suffer; they feared therefore, that the anger of the people against the enemies of their gods—especially as many did not know who these enemies were exactly—would be turned upon themselves, and one of their number, Alexander by name, came forward, in order to shift the blame from themselves upon the Christians; but the appearance of such a person whom they ranked among these enemies, aroused the heathen to still greater fury, and the clamour became more violent. But on this occasion only the populace appear to have been hostile to the teachers of Christianity; the manner in which Paul had lived and acted during his long residence in the city must have operated advantageously on the public authorities of the city. Some even of the magistrates who were placed this year at the head of regulating all the *sacra* in Lesser Asia,* and presided over the public games, shewed their sympathy for him, for when he was on the point of exposing himself to the excited crowd, they besought him not to incur this danger. And the chamberlain of the city at last succeeded in calming the minds of the people by his representations—by calling on them to give an account of the object of their meeting—of which the majority were totally ignorant—and by reminding them of the serious responsibility they incurred for their turbulent and illegal behaviour.

It is very doubtful whether Paul was determined by

* 'Αριεχου: each of the cities which formed the *Koinon* εἰς Ἀσίαν chose a delegate yearly for this college of Ἀριεχου. See *Aristid. orat. sacr. iv. ed. Dindorf. vol. i. p. 531*, and probably the president of this college would be called ἀρχιεπισκοπος, ἀριεπισκοπος; his name was employed in marking the date of public events; see the Letter of the Church at Smyrna, on the martyrdom of Polycarp; and Ezechiel Spanheim *de præstantia et usu numismatum, ed. secunda, p. 691*.

this disturbance, which seems to have been quite transitory, to leave Ephesus earlier than he had intended according to his original plan. When he wrote his first letter to the Corinthians, he spoke to them of the dangers which daily threatened him, and yet these had no influence in determining the length of his sojourn in this city. Perhaps we may find several allusions to this new disturbance.* A comparison of the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians with one another, may indeed favour the belief, that Paul wrote the latter after this event, since he here writes as one who had been rescued from impending death.† But it may indeed be

* He says 1 Cor. xv. 31, that he was daily exposed to death, which may lead us to conclude, that when Paul had reached the end of this epistle, (which was probably not written all at once), this disturbance had taken place. Thus we may take the words in v. 32, "*κατα ἐκθροῦντοι λογισμοὶ θηρίων ἐγινοντο βέρα*—*ἀλλὰ παραδόξως ἐσαθην*," with Theodoret, in a literal sense, namely, that it was demanded by the raging populace, as afterwards was often the case in the persecutions of the Christians, that the enemy of the gods should be condemned *ad bestias*, *ad leonem*. But though such a cry might be raised by the infuriated multitude, it is very difficult to suppose, considering the existing circumstances, that their desire would be granted, and Paul therefore could never say, that, as far as he could expect according to human judgment, he would have been a prey to the wild beasts without the wonderful help of God. Also this interpretation of the words *κατα ἐκθροῦντοι*, is not the easiest and most favoured by the connection. I rather find in these words, according to the connection, the contrast to the Christian hope, the designation of the standing-point of men in general who are destitute of this hope. By the wild beasts must therefore be understood, savage infuriated men with whom Paul had to contend. From Rom. xvi. 4, where it is said that Priscilla and Aquila had ventured their lives for him, as well as from what Paul says in Acts xx. 19, we may gather that he was exposed to many dangers at Ephesus, which are not mentioned in the Acts.

† According to the interpretation proposed by Rückert, these expressions do not refer to persecutions endured by Paul, but to a dangerous illness, the effects of which accompanied him to Macedonia, and were felt by him when he wrote this second Epistle to the Corinthians. But on comparing all

supposed, that when he found himself in the midst of those dangers, the higher concerns of which he treated

that relates to it, I cannot assent to this view. As to the passage in 2 Cor. i. 8, it appears to me that these words must be explained according to v. 5. I grant, indeed, that natural diseases may be called in a certain sense *καταστροφὴ τοῦ σώματος*; but, in accordance with the Pauline phraseology, we should certainly apply them primarily to suffering for the cause of the kingdom of God, in which the believer follows Christ. Rückert thinks that if Paul had intended to signify the persecution that had been excited at Ephesus, he would have named the city itself, as in the first epistle. But I do not see why he should not choose the general designation of the region of which Ephesus was the metropolis; and, it is possible, that the exasperation of the heathens against him spread from Ephesus, to other parts of Lesser Asia which he visited. Why then might he not say, that the persecutions exceeded the measure of his human strength, that he was almost overcome, and despaired of his life? In 2 Cor. iv. 9 and 11, he distinctly notices persecutions by which he was in continual danger of death, with which 1 Cor. xv. 30-31 agrees; from these passages we may conclude that he was exposed to more dangers than are recorded in the Acts. And in this way other passages must be explained. The mention of the earthen vessels is not against this view, for the conflicts which Paul had to sustain always served to awaken in his mind a more vivid consciousness, that he carried about the divine treasure in an earthen broken vessel, that this shattered receptacle would soon be entirely destroyed by such assaults unless strengthened and rescued by Almighty power. He might well say in v. 10, that he always bore about in his body the *σημεῖα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, because he was always exposed to death for the cause of Christ, (v. 11), and bearing the marks of these sufferings in his body, he thus carried with him an image of the suffering Saviour in his own person. What he says in v. 9, and in the whole context, marks the disposition of one who had reason to consider the duration of his life as very uncertain, whether he met with a natural or violent death. 2 Cor. vi. 9 is to be explained according to iv. 9 and 11. 2 Cor. vii. 5 shews that even in Macedonia he had no respite from his sufferings, but was overwhelmed with fresh trials. Here we find no trace of illness. The word *κατὰ* by no means justifies us in understanding the passage of illness; it denotes every thing which could affect the outer man, while within the highest peace might be enjoyed. The passage in 2 Cor. xii. 7 is too obscure

in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, so occupied him, that he forgot every thing personal—but that when he had left Ephesus, the recollections of the special leadings of Providence, which had rescued him from such dangers, filled him with overflowing gratitude which he could not suppress.

After Paul had laboured at Troas in preaching the gospel, and had waited in vain for Titus, whom he expected on his return from Corinth, he left that place with troubled feelings and went to meet him in Macedonia. Among the Macedonian churches he met with gratifying proofs of the advance of the Christian life, to which their conflicts with the world had contributed. No persecutions of Christianity as a *religio illicita* had as yet been commenced by the authorities of the state. But at all events, the Christians, by their withdrawing from the heathen worship and all that was connected with it, must have unfavourably impressed the heathen among whom they lived, and excited the hatred of the fanatical populace who were instigated by the Jews. Even if no legal charge could be brought against the believers as apostates from the religion of the state, still without this instrument, zealous heathens, who formed so large a majority, possessed sufficient means to oppress or injure in their worldly prospects a class of persons so far below themselves, in numbers, respectability, and political influence. It may illustrate this, if we only think of what converts to Christianity in the East Indies have had to endure (though under a Christian government), from their heathen relatives and connections! But the Macedonian Christians cheerfully endured every thing for the cause of the gospel, and, however much their means of subsistence had been injured, they were ready to take

to draw any conclusion from it with certainty; and even if here a chronic disorder were intended, it would not be clear that what was said before had any reference to it. We do not deny that Paul had to combat with much bodily weakness;—we do not deny that the tribulation he endured must have impaired his bodily strength; but it does not follow that the passages above quoted have such a reference.

an active part in the collection made by Paul in the church at Jerusalem, even "beyond their power;" 2 Cor. viii. In Macedonia, the apostle had also the satisfaction of meeting with Titus, and of learning from him that his epistle had produced a salutary effect, if not on the whole, yet on the greater part of the Corinthian church. The disapprobation of the larger and better part had been expressed against the incestuous person, and the voice of this majority, which as such must have been decisive in the assemblies of the church, had either actually expelled him from church-communion, according to the judgment expressed by Paul, or the actual execution of the sentence had been put off in the event of his not receiving forgiveness from the apostle. When the resolution of the majority was announced to the offender with expressions of severe reprehension, he expressed the greatest sorrow and penitence. On this account, the majority, who always acknowledged the apostolic authority of Paul, interceded on his behalf that a milder course might be adopted, and Paul assented, in order that the penitent might not be plunged in despair, and thus a greater calamity ensue.* The majority shew-

* In the words 2 Cor. ii. 5-10, I cannot find any thing different from what I have stated in the text. Nor do they support Rückert's assertion, that the majority of the church, though they expressed their disapprobation of the offender, were not disposed to proceed against him as severely as Paul desired, and that the apostle only yielded to their wishes from prudential motives, in order to maintain his authority, and to preserve the appearance of directing their decisions. Paul says, 2 Cor. ii. 6, "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment which was inflicted of many." From this we cannot infer that it differed from the sentence passed by the apostle himself. *This*, said he—only referring to what had taken place, and in connection with what followed—is indeed not unanimous, but yet the punishment awarded to him by the voice of the majority. It is sufficient—may mean, enough has been done that this sentence of the majority has been expressed, and that he has been brought to contrition, so that now a milder course may be adopted, and he may be received again into church-communion. Or, it is sufficient "the majority have adopted this resolution. But, since

ed the greatest regard for the apostle's authority; they lamented having occasioned him so much trouble, and assured him how earnestly they longed to see him soon among them. But Paul's opponents among the Judaizers were not humbled, but, on the contrary, were only embittered against him by his reprimand and the submission paid to him by the rest of the church, and used every means in their power to make the church suspicious of him. They said, that he was powerful only in his letters, but that "his bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible;" 2 Cor. x. 10. He threatened more than he could perform, and hence was very far from formidable. He was conscious of his weakness, and, therefore, was always threatening to come, but never came. In his first epistle, which has not come down to us, he probably threatened the contumacious, that he would soon come to Corinth, and if what was amiss were not rectified, he would exert the utmost prerogative of his office. In that last epistle, or by verbal communications, he had announced to them that as soon as he had left Ephesus, he would come immediately to them, as he wished, after a transient sojourn at Corinth, to travel into Macedonia, and return again to them in order to remain with them till his intended departure to Jerusalem. But as he now remained longer in Ephesus, as he had altered the plan of his journey, and had announced to the Corinthians that he would first go into Macedonia and

he is now penitent, it need not be carried into effect. The pain which he has already suffered is enough. Hence, instead of continuing to act with that strictness, and carrying into effect that resolution of the church, they might announce forgiveness to him, for (v. 9) Paul had attained his object; they had, by virtue of that resolution of the majority, given him the proof he required of their obedience. He required nothing more (v. 10), as they had assented to his severe sentence; so now he was ready to excuse them, as he had attained the object he had at heart, the welfare of the church. Paul also expressly commends (vii. 11) the indignation they had manifested in this affair, the *indignatio* they had felt, thus acquitting themselves of all participation in the wickedness.

then come to them;* so he took advantage of this arrangement to excuse a sense of his weakness, of vacillation, and of ambiguity in his expressions. And thus uncertain and vacillating—they concluded, he would be as a teacher. Hence his self-contradictory conduct in reference to the observance of the Mosaic Law by the Jews and Gentiles. They endeavoured to set in a false light that Christian prudence which always distinguished Paul, but which was united in him with perfect simplicity of intention, as if he had employed a variety of artifices to deceive men. Also all that was amiss which he had denounced in his letters, had not yet been put away by that part of the church which adhered to the apostle. Such being the state of the Corinthian church, Paul thought it best—in order that his own visit to Corinth might be disturbed by no unpleasant occurrences, and that his intercourse with the Corinthians might be one of joy and love—to write once more to them, in order to prepare the way for his personal ministry among them. He sent Titus with two other able persons in the service of the church, as bearers of this epistle to Corinth.†

In reference to that marked suspicion of his conduct and character, Paul appeals in this epistle to the testimony of his own conscience, that in his intercourse with men in general, and especially with the Corinthians, he

* We therefore need not assume a lost epistle contained this altered plan of the journey.

† One of these (2 Cor. viii. 18) was chosen from the Macedonian churches, that he might in their name convey the collection to Jerusalem, and he is distinguished as one, whose "praise was in all the churches," for his activity in publishing the gospel. We may indeed suppose, that Luke is the person intended, and must then assume, that Paul was left behind at Philippi, where Luke afterwards joined him; but that the latter, after his return from Corinth, again stayed at Philippi, and on the departure of Paul to Jerusalem, intended to join him there. It is indeed remarkable that Luke, who generally gives a fuller narrative when he was an eye-witness, touches so slightly on this in the Acts. But his brevity may be explained from the fact of his being more copious in relating the personal ministry of Paul.

had been guided not by worldly prudence, but by the Spirit of God; he contrasts one with the other, since he considered simplicity and uprightness of intention as the essential mark of the agency of the Divine Spirit. His epistle also testifies this; as he wrote, so he thought;* he had nothing in his mind different from his avowed intentions. He states the reasons of the alteration in the plan of his journey, and draws the conclusion, that no inconsistency can be found in what he had said on this matter. And he could call God to witness, that no inconsistency could be found in his manner of publishing the gospel, that he had always preached one unchangeable doctrine of Christ, and the promises which they received, would be certainly fulfilled through Christ.† God himself had given them as well as him the certain pledge of this, by the common witness of the Holy Spirit in their hearts; (2 Cor. i. 16–22.)

The duty of vindicating his apostolic character against the accusations of his opponents, forced him to speak much of himself. The palpably evident object of his doing this, and the distinction which he was always careful to make between the divine power connected with his apostolic functions, and the person of a feeble mortal, between “the man in Christ” and the weak Paul,‡ suffi-

* 2 Cor. i. 12, 13. The grounds on which De Wette objects to this interpretation, are not obvious to me. “But what suspicion of duplicity might the confident assertions in v. 12 awaken.” This verse could indeed awaken no such suspicion, but rather contradicts that suspicion which Paul’s enemies sought to excite; v. 13 serves to corroborate what he had said in v. 12. Paul makes the appeal, that in his epistle, as well as in his whole ministry, nothing could be found of a σοφία σαρκινή, which his adversaries wished to find in those words; he maintains, that all his words, not less than his actions, bore the impress of ἀπολογος.

† Therefore independently of the law of which his adversaries prescribed the observance.

‡ To this the passage in 2 Cor. v. 13 refers. “For whether we be beside ourselves, (the inspiration with which the apostle spake of the divine objects of his calling, of what the power of God effected through his apostolic office—but which

ciently acquitted him of the charge of self-conceit and vain-glory. To common men, who would measure every thing by the same measure, many things might seem strange in Paul's manner of speaking of himself and his ministry, so that they were ready to accuse him of extravagance, of a self-exaltation bordering on insanity. But what impelled him to speak in such strong terms, was not personal feeling, but the inspired consciousness of the divine power attached to the gospel and to his apostolic calling, which would triumph over all opposition. Thus the fact of his "not being able to do any thing of himself" redounded in his view to the glory of God.

Paul spent the rest of the summer and autumn in Macedonia; he probably extended his labours to the neighbouring country of Illyria,* and then removed to Achaia, where he spent the winter.

Since he was now resolved, after his return from the journey to Jerusalem, which he proposed undertaking at the beginning of the spring, to change the scene of his labours to the West, and to visit the metropolis of the Roman Empire for the first time, he must have been gratified to form a connection previously with the church in

his adversaries treated as empty boasting, and ascribed to an *αποστολή* or *μυστήριον*) it is to the glory of God; or whether we be sober (when the apostle speaks of himself as a weak mortal, puts himself on a level with the Corinthians, and makes no use of its apostolic power and its privileges) it is for your welfare."

* In 2 Cor. x. 14-16, Paul seems to mark Achaia as the extreme limit of his labours in preaching the gospel; (this indeed does not follow from the *ἕως καὶ θανάτου*, since *ἕως* in itself does not denote a fixed or exclusive limit, see Rom. v. 13, though Paul sometimes uses the word in this latter meaning, Gal. iii. 19; iv. 2; yet it appears to proceed from the comparison of the three verses in connection); on the other in Rom. xv. 19, Illyria is thus marked. But it does not follow from this last passage, that Paul himself had preached the gospel in Illyria; possibly he only mentioned this as the extreme limit *as far as* which he had reached in preaching the gospel.

that city. The journey of Phœbe, the deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, who had been induced by various circumstances to visit Rome, gave him the best opportunity for this purpose, while, at the same time, he recommended her to the care of the Roman church.*

* It is here taken for granted, that the 16th chapter belongs with the whole of the Epistle to the Romans, which in modern times has been disputed by Schulz in the "Studien und Kritiken," vol. ii. p. 609; but, as it appears to me, on insufficient grounds. It may excite surprise that Paul should salute so many individuals in a church to which he was personally a stranger, and that we find among them relations and old friends of the apostle from Palestine, and other parts of the East. But we must recollect, that Rome was always the rendezvous of persons from all parts of the Roman empire, a fact stated by Athenæus in the strongest terms, *Deipnosoph.* i. 20, *ἐν Ῥωμαίων πολλοὶ ἐπιτομήν τῆς αἰουμένης, ἐν ᾗ συνδιδῶσιν πᾶσαι τὰς πόλεις Ἰερουσαλὴμ, (such as Alexandria, Antioch, Nicomedia, and Athens)—καὶ γὰρ ἅλα τὰ ἱερὰ ἀθροῦν αὐτοὶ συνήκισται.* Paul might easily become personally acquainted at Ephesus and Corinth with many Christians from Rome, or learn particulars respecting them. Among those whom he salutes were persons of the family of Narcissus, who was well-known to be a freed-man of the Emperor Claudius. That Aquila and Priscilla were again in Rome, that a part of the church assembled in their house, and that a number of years afterwards, as may be inferred from the 2d Epistle to Timothy, they are to be found at Ephesus,—all this, from what we have before remarked, is not so surprising. The warning against the Judaizing teachers xvi. 17, who published another doctrine than what they had received (from the disciples of the apostle), agrees perfectly with what is said in the 14th chapter, and with what we may infer from the epistle itself, in reference to the state of the Roman church. The passage in xvi. 19 agrees also with i. 8, and the comparison confirms the belief that they both belong to the same epistle. Baner, in his essay before quoted, has endeavoured to prove the spuriousness of the two last chapters. He believes that, in the 15th chapter especially, he can trace a later writer attached to Pauline principles, who thought that, in order to justify Paul, and to bring about a union between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, it was necessary to make some additions to the epistle; but I cannot perceive the validity of the evidence adduced by this acute critic. Paul was probably prevented when he had finished the 14th

It is not improbable that, at an early period, the seed of the gospel was brought by Jewish Christians to the Jews at Rome, as at that time, if we may judge from the salutations at the end of the epistle, persons who were among the oldest Christians lived at Rome; but

chapter, from continuing the epistle to the close. And when he took it up again where he left off, and looked back on what he had last written, he felt himself impelled to add something on the theme of which he had last treated, the harmony between the Gentile and Jewish Christians in the Roman church. His object was, on the one hand, to check the free-thinking Gentile Christian from self-exaltation in relation to their weaker Jewish brethren in the faith; and on the other hand, to remind the Jewish Christians that the admission of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God was no infringement of the rights of the Jewish people, and that it was in unison with the predictions of the Old Testament. He exhorts them, xv. 7, to receive one another mutually as members of the same kingdom of God, though with a special reference to the Gentile Christians, to whom Paul at the beginning of the chapter particularly addressed himself, if we follow the best accredited reading, *ἀλλήλοις*. He then states the reasons why the Gentiles had especial cause to praise God, to be thankful and humble, since God had in so unexpected a manner brought them to a participation of his kingdom, who previously knew nothing of it, and who had no hopes of this kind, (a train of thought which he introduces elsewhere, Ephes. ii. 12, and in several other passages). He shews that God, by the sending of Christ to the Jews, manifested his faithfulness, since thus he had fulfilled the promises made to the fathers; but had manifested his mercy to the Gentiles, since he had called to a participation in the kingdom of God, those among whom the foundation of this kingdom had not been laid, and to whom no promises had been given. Such a theoretical contrast is of course not perfectly strict, but partial, and of a kind frequently employed by Paul. For he says, and the Old Testament intimates, that the Messiah would extend his saving efficiency to the Gentiles; hence, it is evident, that God while he shews mercy to them, at the same time verifies his faithfulness. In all this, we find nothing unpauline, nothing foreign to the object of this epistle. It is impossible that Paul could intend to close with the fourteenth chapter, but according to the usual style of the Pauline epistles, a conclusion must necessarily follow, which these two last chapters furnish.

these certainly did not form the main body of the church, for the greater part evidently consisted of Christians of Gentile descent, to whom the gospel had been published by men of the Pauline school, independently of the Mosaic Law, to whom Paul, as the apostle of the Gentiles, felt himself called to write, and whom, in consequence of the relation, he could address with greater freedom. How could Paul, from his call to publish the gospel to all the nations of the world, infer his call to announce the doctrine of salvation to the Romans, if he had not believed that those to whom his epistle was especially addressed were Gentiles? For the Jews, whether living among the Romans or Greeks, always considered themselves as belonging not to the עַמּוּל , אֲרָם , but to the one עַם , the $\lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ in the $\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha$. In reference to them, Paul could only have spoken of being sent to one nation. How could he say (Rom. i. 13) that he wished to come to Rome in order "to have some fruit" there, "even as among other Gentiles," by the publication of the gospel, if he was not writing principally to persons belonging to the Gentiles, among whom alone he had hitherto been wont to gain fruit? Verse 14 shews that he was not thinking of Jews in distant parts. How otherwise could he be induced to assert, that as elsewhere, so also in the metropolis of the civilized world, he was not ashamed to publish the gospel? For in reference to the Jews, it could make no great difference whether he met with them at Jerusalem or at Rome; the same obstacles to their believing the gospel existed in both places, owing to which Jesus the Crucified was an offence to them. It cannot be concluded from his addressing the Gentile Christians so pointedly in xi. 13, that the epistle in general was not intended for them; for at all events—since there were Jews in the Church, though they formed the minority—when he expressed any thing which was applicable only to the Gentile members, it was needful that he should thus distinguish it. If we suppose those Jewish Christians who taught the continued obligation of the Mosaic Law to have formed the original body of

the Church, it will not be easy to explain how Gentile Christians who adopted the Pauline principles (and who must evidently have been a minority), could join themselves to such. But it is very different, if we suppose this church to have been constituted like others of the Gentile christians of whom we have before spoken. Moreover, in the Neronian persecution, the Christian church appears as a new sect hated by the people, a *genus tertium*, of whom the people were disposed to credit the worst reports, because they were opposed to all the forms of religion hitherto in existence. But this could not have been the case if Judaism had been the predominant element in the Roman church. The Christians would then have been scarcely distinguished from the Jews, and it was not usual to pay much attention to the internal religious disputes of the Jews. In the controversy with the churches in Lesser Asia, the bishops of Rome were the opponents of the Jewish Christian Easter; this was closely connected with the formation of the Christian cultus on Pauline principles, and an appeal could here be made to an ancient tradition. To the marks of an anti-Jewish tendency belongs also the custom of fasting on the Sabbath. The opinion that this anti-Jewish tendency arose as a reaction against an earlier Judaizing tendency, is at variance with what has been said, and is also inconsistent with historical truth; for since at a later period we see the hierarchical element (which is decidedly Jewish, and favourable rather than otherwise to Judaism), peculiarly prominent in the Roman church, so it is difficult to suppose that exactly at this time a reaction should be produced against Judaism,* arising from primitive Christian knowledge and the Pauline spirit. In the work of Hermas, we recog-

* Dr Baur, whose views I am here opposing, in his essay against Rothe, on the origin of episcopacy in the Christian church, (*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1838, part iii. p. 141), endeavours to prove that this reaction against Judaism, supposing that to have originally predominated, took place at a later period in the Roman church.

nise indeed a conception of Christianity more according to James than according to Paul, (and yet not throughout and entirely Judaizing), but we know too little of the relation in which the author of this book stood to the whole Roman church, to determine any thing respecting the leading tendency of the latter. This remark applies more strongly to the Clementines of which the origin is so uncertain, and which by the leading sentiments is essentially distinguished from the Shepherd of Hermas, although some points of affinity exist in the two works. In Rome, the capital of the world, where the various kinds of religion were assembled from all countries, the different Christian sects would soon seek a settlement, and establish themselves. We, therefore, are not justified in saying of every sect which we see arising out of the bosom of the Roman church, that it proceeded from the religious tendency that originally predominated in it, and was a reaction against tendencies subsequently formed. This applies particularly to the Monarchians, who yet could not all be referred to a Judaizing element; for a Praxeas, of whom we certainly know, that he found a point of connection in the whole Roman church,—which cannot be asserted of other kinds of Monarchians—formed by his peculiar conceptions of the doctrine of Christ as a God revealing and revealed, the most direct opposition to the Judaizing standing-point, in many respects still more, than was at that time the case with the common church doctrine of Subordination. But when the Artemonites appealed to their agreement with the earlier Roman bishops, we cannot accept this as historical evidence. All sects have always an interest to claim a high antiquity for their doctrine, and the Artemonites could easily make use for their purpose of many indefinite expressions of earlier doctrinal statements. They appealed generally to the antiquity of their doctrine in the church, and yet we know that the ancient hymns and the apologies could with justice be adduced against them as witnesses for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. We consider, therefore, the opinion is well grounded, that the Roman church was formed principally from the stock

of Gentile Christians, and that the Pauline form of doctrine originally prevailed among them.*

In this church, the state of affairs was similar to that which for the most part existed in churches where the Gentile Christian element predominated, though mingled with the Jewish Christian. The Jewish Christians could not bring themselves to acknowledge the Gentiles, who neglected the ceremonial law, as altogether their equals in relation to the kingdom of God; the Gentile Christians also still retained those feelings of contempt with which they were wont to contemplate the Jews, and the manner in which the greater part of the Jews opposed the publication of the gospel, confirmed them in this temper of mind; Rom. xi. 17-18.

Paul in this epistle, lays before the church, which he had not yet taught personally, the fundamental principles of the gospel; he wished, as he himself says, Rom. xv. 15, to recall to their remembrance† what had been

* The testimony of Hilarius (the so-called Ambrosian), to which Baur appeals as historical evidence, we certainly dare not estimate too highly; for this writer of the second half of the fourth century could hardly make use of historical sources on the constitution of the Roman church to which Paul wrote. He had scarcely any other sources of information than we have; his testimony appears to be only as deduced from this epistle according to his own interpretation of it.

† It is generally supposed that the *ἀπο μέρους* in this verse relates to some particular passages of the epistle, which might seem to be written in too bold a tone. We might admit this, if any severe censure were to be met with in this epistle on the faults of his church, as in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. In this case, we might suppose that Paul would think proper to apologize for such harsh expressions, as proceeding from one who was not personally known to the church. But such animadversions on the church we do not find in this epistle; and all that he says respecting the state of the Gentile world, to which they belonged before their conversion, as well as in all that he says to warn them against self-exaltation, I can find nothing which would occasion an apology on the part of such a man as Paul. Hence, I cannot help considering the *ἀπο μέρους* only as qualifying the *τελευτησας*, or that it relates to what follows. Paul places the boldness in

announced to them as the doctrine of Christianity, and to testify that this was the genuine Christian truth, which alone could satisfy the religious wants of human nature, and exhorted them not to allow themselves to be led astray by any strange doctrine. This epistle may therefore serve to inform us, what was in Paul's estimation the essence of the gospel. He begins with assuring them that shame could not have kept him back from publishing the gospel in the capital of the civilized world; for he never had occasion to be ashamed of the doctrine of the gospel, since everywhere, among Gentiles as well as Jews, it had shewn itself capable of working with divine power for the salvation of men, if they only believed it; by this doctrine they all obtained what all alike needed,—that which was essential to the salvation of men,—the means by which they might be brought from a state of estrangement from God in sin, to become holy before God. In order to establish this, it was necessary for the apostle to shew that all, both Jews and Gentiles, were in need of this means. He endeavoured to lead them both to a consciousness of their sinfulness and guilt, and to take notice of that which might prevent either party, according to their respective standing-points, from attaining this consciousness, the self-deceptions and sophisms, which obstructed the discernment of the truths which he announced. He had then to point out to the Gentiles that their consciences testified against

this, that he, though personally unknown to the church as a teacher, ventured to write to them such an epistle in which he might appear to announce the doctrine of salvation, as if it were entirely new to them. But he explains his design, that it was only to "put them in mind" of what they had already heard, and he believed that, in virtue of the ministry committed to him by divine grace, that he was justified in making known the gospel to the Gentiles. He even qualifies the "putting them in mind" by the addition of *et*, thus representing it as something accessory, and not absolutely required. In these words, in the interpretation of which I cannot agree with Baur, I can detect nothing unapostolic. On the contrary, I find here the same Pauline mode of address as in Rom i. 12.

them, that they could not excuse themselves in their sins by pleading ignorance of God and his law ; he objected to the Jews, that that law, in the possession of which they were so proud, could only utter a sentence of condemnation against them as its violators ; he exposed their self-delusion in thinking, that by the works of the law such as they could perform, or in virtue of their descent from the theocratic nation, they could appear as holy before God. After pointing out that both parties were equally in need of the means of salvation, the object he had in view led him to develop the manner in which man, by faith in the Redeemer, might become holy before God, and to exhibit the blessed consequences that followed from this new relation to God ; and in this development, he takes pains, as is evident in various passages, so to influence the two parts of which the church at Rome consisted, the Gentile and the Jewish Christians, that uniting in an equally humble acknowledgment of the grace to which they were indebted for their salvation, neither might exalt themselves above the other ; he closes the whole development with extolling that grace, to which all stood in the same relation, being equally in need of deliverance, and which all must at last unite in glorifying.

In the practical exhortations which form the last part of this epistle, the wisdom is apparent with which Paul treats of the relations in which the new converts to Christianity were placed ; he anticipates the errors into which they were likely to be seduced, and endeavours to suggest the best preservatives against their influence. The seditious spirit of the Jews, which refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of any Gentile government, (see my *Church History*, vol. i. p. 50), could not find ready entrance into the church at Rome, since the majority of its members, being Gentile-Christians, were not exposed to infection on this side. But similar errors, from a misunderstanding of Christian truth, might easily arise among them, as actually happened at a later period. Accustomed to consider themselves as members of the kingdom of God, in opposition to the heathen world, they were in danger of giving an outward form to this oppo-

sition, which properly belonged to the internal disposition, and thus a hostile tendency would be called forth against all existing civil institutions, since they would be looked upon as all belonging to the kingdom of the evil spirit. With the consciousness of belonging to the kingdom of God, a misapprehension arising from carnal views might be connected, that those who were destined to rule hereafter in the kingdom of the Messiah, need not in the present life submit to worldly governments. Such a carnal misapprehension might easily be combined with the doctrine of Christian freedom, and the apostle on other occasions had thought it needful to caution against it; Gal. v. 13. He wished to be beforehand in opposing such practical errors, which his knowledge of human nature led him to anticipate, even if they were not already visible; accordingly, he strictly enjoined on the Roman Christians, that they ought to consider the institution of civil government generally as a divine ordinance, for a definite object in the plan of Providence;* that, under this aspect, they must view the government actually existing, and demean themselves conformably to it.

At the close, he notices a special practical difference in the church. But it may be disputed, in what light we are to view it. As in the fourteenth chapter he places in opposition those who eat, and those who eat not, and by the latter apparently intends those who scrupled to eat flesh and drink wine, and confined themselves to a vegetable diet, (compare v. 2, and v. 21), some have been led to conclude,† that in this church a strong ascetic ten-

* It was not the apostle's design in that passage to develop the whole doctrine of the reciprocal duties of rulers and subjects; but he pursues only one marked antithetical reference, in order to warn Christians of that misapprehension, and hence he leaves all other topics untouched, which otherwise would naturally fall under discussion.

† This view, with various modifications, has been brought forward by Eichorn, in his introduction to the New Testament, and by Baur in his essay on this epistle; by the latter in connection with his view of a predominant Jewish-Christian tendency in the Roman church, allied to the later Ebionitism, and containing its germ.

dency, entirely forbidding animal food and strong drink, had found an entrance, similar to the doctrine of the later Encratitæ. Such a tendency, however foreign to the Hebrew and Grecian religious systems, had in that age insinuated itself in various forms, both among the Jews and Gentiles, owing to the change produced by the breaking up of the ancient mental habitudes of the world, and effected a junction with Christianity, by a mistaken view of the contrariety between the spirit and the flesh, and of the opposition between the world and Christianity. But how can what Paul says on individual cases, be referred to persons under the influence of this tendency? "Let not him that eateth" (he says in v. 3), "*despise* him that eateth not; and let not him who eateth not, *judge* him that eateth;" that is, not condemn, not disallow his participation in the kingdom of God; yet persons of this ascetic tendency did not altogether condemn those who would not consent to such abstinence, but they believed that they were inferior to themselves, and not so far advanced in the perfection of the spiritual life. Paul therefore ought rather to have said, Let such a one *despise* him that eateth. Or we must assume that these persons had gone so far as to consider the eating of flesh to be absolutely sinful. But this they could have said only on the principles of a certain dualistic theosophy, which viewed God not as the origin of all creatures; and if Paul had met with such a scheme, he would certainly not have treated it with so much tolerance, but have felt it his duty to combat it strenuously, as utterly opposed to the standing-point of Christian piety. Nor would the exhortation addressed to the other side not to despise such a one, have been suitable in this case; for persons of this tendency had nothing which exposed them to contempt, but it was rather to be feared that, by such a stricter mode of living, they would be held in greater respect than was their due. Besides, how could Paul say of such a one in v. 6, "He that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not and giveth God thanks." Such persons would want the disposition to thank God for all the gifts which he had

granted for human subsistence. How could he, in reference to such a case, say in v. 21, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, in order to give no offence to a brother." It could give no offence to one who was zealous in practising such asceticism, if he saw another brother living with less strictness. But if other Christians believed that they ought to follow his example, he might to his injury be confirmed in his delusion, that such a mode of living had something in it excellent or meritorious. Least of all could we suppose that Paul would treat persons of this sort simply as weak, and shew them so much indulgence, without discussing more fully the principle that formed the basis of their standing-point. And if we do not assume that this principle was an avowed dualism which he must have combated, yet, on any supposition, he could not have acted with so much mildness and forbearance towards an ascetic arrogance of this kind, which was equally in diametric opposition to his doctrine of justification and to the essence of Christian humility. Of such a perversion of religious sentiment, it could not be expected that it would gradually be overcome by the progressive development of faith as the root of the whole Christian life; but it was rather to be feared, that a principle so alien to the Christian life, and so much favoured by certain tendencies of the times, would gather increasing strength, and injure more and more the healthy development of Christianity: several appearances of this kind in the following age justify us in this conclusion. How very differently does Paul speak against such a tendency in the Epistle to the Colossians! Evidently the persons towards whom Paul enjoins forbearance, were such who distinguished certain days as in a special sense dedicated to God, and who could not yet bring themselves to the Christian standing-point, that all days ought in an equal manner to be dedicated to God. We must here recognise the reaction of the Jewish standing-point, (which, since it had its indisputable right in the development of religious truth, and could not be altogether set aside by a single effort, Paul, unless its claims were arrogantly set forth, always treat-

ed with indulgence), and we shall find sufficient reason for referring another topic which concerns the question of abstinence to the same tendency. We shall be led to think of the Jewish Christians, who were still strict observers of the Mosaic law, not only in keeping certain days, but also in refraining from certain kinds of food. We shall be less surprised at this, if we recollect that generally the Christians of Jewish descent, particularly those of Palestine, when they lived at Rome, adhered to their former Jewish mode of life. But in the Mosaic laws relative to food, there was nothing that could occasion scruples about eating flesh or drinking wine. Or we must assume that Paul spoke here only hypothetically and hyperbolically, without thinking of a case, which might really occur under existing circumstances, although this is by no means probable, judging from his mode of expressing himself.

Further, if we think of those Jewish Christians who believed that the Mosaic laws respecting food were still obligatory, it is indeed evident, that Paul must admonish the Gentile Christians who were entangled in no such perplexities, that they ought not to despise their weaker Jewish brethren on account of their scrupulosity, nor lead them to act against their consciences, by working on their feelings of shame. But would he have expressed himself so mildly, if these Jewish Christians had ventured to condemn others who partook of food which they held to be prohibited? In this case, we must suppose it to be the opinion of these Jewish Christians, that the Mosaic law was binding on Gentile Christians, and that without its observance they could not be partakers of the kingdom of God. But we know how emphatically Paul always expressed himself against those who maintained such a sentiment, and in doing so, invalidated his doctrine of justification by faith alone. In addition—and on this point we must lay still greater weight—Paul exhorts the strong in faith and the unscrupulous to take into consideration the necessities of the weak, and rather to refrain from food, which from the standing-point of their own conviction they

could partake of without scruple, than give offence to their weaker brethren. But how would it agree with the principles of this apostle, that he should advise the Gentile Christians to make such a concession, by which they would practically have recognised for their own standing-point the obligatory force of the Mosaic law—since he was more wont to urge on the Gentile Christians not to give place to the Judaizers, who wished to compel them to the observance of the law, but to maintain their Christian freedom against them. In fact, there was no ground for such an exhortation. The Jewish Christians had no cause to be uneasy, because the Gentile Christians did not trouble themselves about the Mosaic laws respecting food. By the stipulation concluded by the apostolic convention at Jerusalem, they were set at liberty from every such restriction. If this gave offence to the Jewish Christians, the offence was unavoidably founded in the evangelical truth itself.

We must therefore think of something connected indeed with the religious standing-point of the Judaizers, but yet something separable from the observance of the Mosaic law,—something that with more appearance of justice the Jewish Christians might require of their Gentile brethren,—something, in which a concession to the weakness of others, might be demanded of Gentile Christians, without encroaching on their Christian freedom. This could be nothing else than abstaining from the flesh of animals offered to idols. Every thing in this section would agree with this alone. The passage would have a meaning applicable to the circumstances of the times, if we suppose those persons to be spoken of who, in certain cases, would rather abstain altogether from animal food, and eat only herbs, that they might unknowingly be in danger of eating something unclean and defiling, the flesh of idolatrous sacrifices. In v. 2, Paul presents the contrast in the extreme point, on the one side, a strength of faith which proceeds so far as to banish all scruples respecting the enjoyment of food, and on the other side, the extreme of scrupulosity, arising

from weakness of faith, which would rather eat no meat whatever, in order to avoid the danger of eating the flesh of animals offered to idols. Now, it is evident, how Paul could say, that if needs be, it would be better not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, rather than disturb the conscience of a weak brother. We need only recollect that the heathens accompanied their sacrifices with libations;* that the same scruples which existed relative to the meat of the sacrifices, would also arise in reference to the wine of the libations. But that the apostle has not expressly mentioned the sacrifices, can in our opinion occasion no perplexity. He had in view only such readers as would at once understand from his words what he meant; so in ordinary letters, many things are not stated in detail, because it is presumed that the persons to whom they are addressed perfectly understand the allusions.

We must therefore conceive the state of affairs in this church to have been similar to that in the Corinthian, which we have already noticed. Some gave themselves no concern about the injunction against meat offered to idols, like the free-thinking Corinthians, and ridiculed the scrupulosity of the Jewish Christians; others, on the contrary, considered the eating of such food as absolutely sinful, and hence passed sentence of condemnation on those who ventured to eat every thing without distinction. Thus also some were still too much accustomed to consider certain days as peculiarly sacred, according to the Jewish standing-point; those who thought more freely, and viewed the subject from the pure Christian standing-point, were disposed to make no religious difference between one day and another. Such a state of things as this could only exist in a community which was formed similarly to the Corinthian church, which consisted of a majority of Christians of Gentile descent, but with an addition to the original materials of a subor-

* See the Mishnah in the treatise *עבירה וזרה* on idolatrous worship, c. ii. § 3, ed. Surenhus. P. iv. 369, 384.

dinate Jewish element.* Paul begins his exhortation, without particularly designating the persons he addressed, yet having chiefly in view the more free-thinking Gentile Christians, which also confirms the notion, that these formed the main body of the church. He declares the standing-point of these persons to be correct in theory; but as in the first epistle to the Corinthians, he censures the want of Christian love in them, who so little regarded what affected the welfare of their weaker brethren, and with that defect, the misapprehension of Christian freedom, which was shewn in their laying such great stress on what was outward and in itself indifferent, as if the true good of Christians consisted in such things, instead of being something grounded in their inner life, which would remain secure whether they could use or not use these outward things. The participation of the kingdom of God consisted not in meat and drink, (the true possessions and privileges, the true freedom of the members of God's kingdom consisted not in eating or drinking this or that, outward things in general being signified by this expression,) but in the participation of those heavenly possessions of the inner man—righteousness (in the Pauline sense, the designation of the whole relation in which the *ἐν πίστει δικαίος* stands to God), the heavenly peace flowing from it, the happiness of the divine life, Rom. xv. 17. He recommends mutual forbearance and love to both parties, that no one should judge another, but each one should seek to be well grounded in his own convictions, and act accordingly; but that the more mature in Christian conviction should condescend to the standing-point of those who were not so far advanced, since more is required from the strong than from the weak.

After Paul had spent three months in Achaia, he

* It agrees with this view, that in Rom. xv. 7 (a passage closely connected with what goes before), the subject is the agreement between Gentile and Jewish Christians; and that Paul in Rom. vi. 17, warns them of the common Judaizers, who by the spread of their principles endeavoured to excite divisions in such mixed churches.

wished to depart with the sums collected for the poor Christians at Jerusalem, and thus to close his apostolic ministry in the East.* This plan was wisely formed by

* Though I agree for the most part with Dr Schneckenburger in what he says (in his work on the Acts) on the intention of this last journey to Jerusalem; yet I cannot entirely assent to what he thinks may be deduced from the silence of the Acts on this collection, and the object of this journey, in favour of the hypothesis which he has advanced. I must also avow myself opposed to Dr Baur's views, who in his Essay on the Romans, and his Dissertation on Episcopacy, endeavours to shew that the author of the Acts misrepresented the facts, and set them in a false light from a one-sided, apologetic intention; see his review of Dr Schneckenburger in the *Jahrbuch für wissenschaftliche Kritik*. March 1841. These two critics are struck with the omission of a transaction of so much importance in the historical connection of events, and hence believe, that they must find out a special reason for it in the object which the author of the Acts proposed to himself in writing his work. As he was disposed to assume ignorance of the continued division between the Jews and Gentile Christians, and always represents only the Jews, and not the Jewish Christians, as adversaries of the apostle, so he could not adduce any thing which might testify against his assumption, or that even might serve to lessen the opposition which he kept out of sight; and hence he could not represent this last journey of Paul in its true light. Had we reason to expect in this age of the church, a comprehensive historical representation, explaining the causes and connection of events, if the Acts were the appearance of such a work, had its author been a Christian Thucydides or Polybius—we might then have admitted the inference, that either he was at too great a distance from the events to know any thing of this collection, or of the real object of this journey, or that, owing to a one-sided bias, he had consciously or unconsciously falsified the history. But such a statesmanlike point of view, which could be formed only where the development of events could be surveyed with a certain calmness of mind and a philosophic interest, was totally foreign to the standing-point of Christian history at this time, and especially to that of the Acts. It consists of memoirs, as the author gave them from the sources of information within his reach, or from his own recollection, without following any definite plan. He mentions the last journey of Paul to Jerusalem, on account of the serious conse-

him, and this his last journey to Jerusalem with the collection is to be viewed as marking an epoch in the development of the church, whose importance we must consider more closely. A year had passed since he had with great zeal set this collection on foot among the churches of Gentile Christians in Asia and Europe, and it was of importance to him that it should be very productive. He had already written to the Corinthian church, 1 Cor. xvi. 4, that if this collection equalled his wishes, he would convey it himself to Jerusalem. It was certainly not merely his intention to assist the poor of the church at Jerusalem in their temporal necessities; he had an object still more important for the development of the church, to effect a radical cure of the breach between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, and to seal for perpetuity the unity of the church. As the immediate power of love can effect more to heal the schism of souls, than all formal conferences in favour of

quences to the apostle himself, without reflecting further on his object in undertaking it, and probably passed over the collection as being in that view unimportant; his interest would be engaged by other objects; and reflections which would only present themselves from a comprehensive survey of history, would be totally absent from his thoughts. Yet this bountiful collection might be included among the practical proofs which Paul gave (Acts xxi. 19), of the success of his ministry among the Gentiles; why should he have been intentionally silent respecting it? If he could say what is mentioned in that passage, without injury to the design imputed to him, could he not also say, 'The presbyters of the church at Jerusalem praised God for kindling such active brotherly love in the hearts of the believing Gentiles. Yet the author of the Acts, by his account in ch. xx. v. 21, implies the continued enmity of the Jewish Christians against Paul. I do not see, therefore, what could have induced him designedly to have suppressed earlier facts relating to it. In Paul's defence in Acts xxiv. 17, there is actually an allusion to the collection, which therefore the author could not have intended to conceal. But if the Acts had been a connected history, or a narrative from one source, this collection, that is only mentioned accidentally, must have been recorded earlier in its place in the regular series of events.

union, so the manner in which the Gentile churches evinced their love and gratitude to the Mother church, would accomplish what had not yet been attained by all attempts at union. Paul wished, since he was accompanied to Jerusalem by the messengers of these churches, who practically contradicted the charges disseminated against him by his Jewish and Judaizing adversaries,—that the proofs of the sympathizing and self-sacrificing love of the Gentile Christians should serve as evidence to the Jewish Christians, who had imbibed prejudices against them, of what could be effected by the preaching of the gospel independently of the law of Moses; so that they would be obliged to acknowledge the operation of God's Spirit among these, whom they had always been indisposed to receive as brethren in the faith. Paul himself plainly indicates this to have been his chief object in this collection and journey, (2 Cor. ix. 12-15); that not only this service of love might relieve the wants of the Christians at Jerusalem, but that many hearts might be excited to gratitude to God; when they saw how the faith of Gentile Christians had verified itself by this act of kindness, they would feel compelled to praise God for this practical testimony to the gospel, and through the manner in which the grace of God had shewn its efficacy among them, being filled with love to them, they would make them objects of their intercessions. A reciprocal communion of prayer in thanksgiving and intercession, was always considered as the mark and seal of genuine Christian brotherhood; he therefore wished to bring about such a union of heart between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. Before he extended his labours for the spread of the church in other lands, he was anxious for the security and stability of the work of which the foundation had been already laid; but which was exposed to the greatest danger on the side of that earliest controversy, which was always threatening to break forth again.

Yet it all depended on this, whether the apostle of the Gentiles could succeed in carrying his wisely formed plan into effect; he was well aware, what hindrances and

dangers obstructed his progress. It was questionable whether the power of love would succeed in overcoming the narrow-heartedness of the Jewish spirit, and induce the Jewish Christians to receive as brethren, the Gentile brethren who accompanied him. And what had he to expect from the Jews, when he, after they had heard so much of his labours among the Gentiles, which had excited their fanatical hatred,—personally appeared among them; if he who in his youth had been known as a zealous champion of Pharisaism, was now seen accompanied by uncircumcised Gentiles as messengers from Gentile churches, whose equal birthright for the kingdom of the Messiah he zealously advocated? Fully alive to the difficulties and dangers which he must overcome in order to attain his great object, he entreated the Roman Christians for their intercessory prayers, that he might be delivered from the unbelievers among the Jews, and that this service might be well received by the Christians at Jerusalem, that he might come to them from thence with joy and be refreshed by them; Romans xv. 31, 32.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIFTH AND LAST JOURNEY OF PAUL TO JERUSALEM—
ITS IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES—HIS IMPRISONMENT IN
PALESTINE.

AFTER staying three months in Achaia, Paul departed from Corinth in the spring of the year 58 or 59, about the time of the Jewish Passover. His companions went before him to Troas, and he first visited Philippi, where he joined Luke, who had been left there some time before. As he earnestly wished to be in Jerusalem at the Pentecost, it was necessary to hasten his journey; on that account he did not venture to go to Ephesus, but sent from Miletus for the overseers of the Ephesian church, and

probably those of other neighbouring Asiatic churches.* to come to him, that in the anticipation of the great dan-

* We cannot conclude with certainty from Paul's farewell address to the overseers of the church, which is given in the 20th chapter of the Acts, that the overseers of other churches in Lesser Asia, besides those of Ephesus, were present on that occasion. The words in Acts xx. 25, *ἰν αὐτῷ διακρίσειν*, may favour this supposition, since they denote rather travelling through a certain district, than a continued residence in one place; but these words may also be fairly understood of the apostle's labours in different parts of Ephesus, and the visits he paid to the houses of the presbyters. The singular *ἐκ ἐκείνων*, v. 28, 29, leads us to think most naturally of only one church, though it may be here used collectively, and include many churches. It is worthy of notice, that Irenæus applies it to the overseers of distinct churches, and speaks of it in very decided language. "In Mileto convocatis episcopis et presbyteris, qui erant ab Epheso, et a reliquis proximis civitatibus," iii. c. 14, § 2. Judging from the character of Irenæus and his times, it is not probable that he would be induced simply by that expression in Paul's address, to deviate from the letter of the narrative in the Acts. Hence we might rather suppose, that Irenæus was decided in giving a different representation by historical traditions or documents with which he had become acquainted in Lesser Asia. Yet the bias of the episcopal system (which was then germinating) might perhaps occasion a different construction of the passage, than the literal narrative would warrant, independently of any tradition. Paul applies to the presbyters the epithet *ἐκκλησιαστικοί*; now it could not then be surprising to find the *ἐκκλησιαστικοί* designated presbyters, for this latter name was still the generic by which both might be denoted, but the name *ἐκκλησιαστικοί* was already exclusively applied to the first church governors, the presidents of the college of presbyters. Since, then, we proceed on the supposition that this institution of church government was the same from the beginning, we must hence conclude from the name *ἐκκλησιαστικοί*, that the bishops of other churches were present at this meeting, and hence Irenæus says expressly "*episcopis et presbyteris*." But if we admit that this meeting consisted of the overseers of the various churches in Lesser Asia, the discrepancy between the three years, Acts xx. 31, and the two years and three months, of the duration of Paul's stay at Ephesus, according to Luke's narrative, would cease; for we might then suppose, that Paul before he went to Ephesus,

gers that awaited him, he might pour forth his heart to them perhaps for the last time, and utter the parting words of fatherly love.* We recognise in this farewell

spent nine months in other places of Lesser Asia, where he founded churches.

* Dr Baur and Dr Schneckenburger think that it can be shewn, that this address in the 20th ch. of the Acts was not delivered by Paul in its present form, but that it was framed by the author of the Acts, on the same plan as the whole of his history, according to the conciliatory apologetic tendency already noticed. We would not indeed pledge ourselves that the address was taken down as Paul delivered it, with official accuracy—but that it has been faithfully reported in its essential contents, and that an outline of it was in existence earlier than the whole of the Acts. Not only do we find nothing in it which does not correspond to the situation and feelings of the apostle, but it also contains several marks of not being cast in the same mould as the whole of the Acts. Among these marks we reckon the mention of the three years, which does not agree with the reckoning in the Acts, the mention of teaching “from house to house” v. 20, and of the warning voices of the prophets, v. 23. (Schneckenburger, indeed, considers this to be a prolepsis, and finds in it a mark of non-originality; but it is not at all improbable, that already in the churches with whom Paul had stayed, he had received warnings of the dangers that threatened him from the fanatical rage of the Jews, though Luke, who did not accompany Paul every where, has not mentioned this in his brief narrative). Besides, as Paul, speaking of a higher necessity, by which he felt compelled to go to Jerusalem, “bound in spirit,” we may infer that this journey, undertaken for what he considered the work committed to him by the Lord, had a greater significance and importance, as appears from the explanation we have already given, but which is not so represented in the Acts. If this address indicates that it was delivered before delegates from various Asiatic churches, we may also number this among the marks, not that we would attach equal weight to all these marks; but taken collectively, their testimony appears to prove something. And if Luke had before him an earlier written draft of Paul’s address, containing the presentiment he expressed of his impending death, I do not see how any one is justified in maintaining that Paul could not have uttered it, in case this anticipation had not been fulfilled. According to truth, he must have allowed him to speak as he actually spoke. But it could not

address, in which Paul's heart, thoroughly imbued with the love of Christ, expresses itself in so affecting a manner, his fatherly anxiety for the churches, whose overseers heard his warning voice for the last time, and whom he was about to leave at a time full of sad and dark foreboding, when many dangers threatened pure Christianity.

He could not foresee with certainty what consequences would result from his journey to Jerusalem, for these depended on a combination of circumstances, too intricate for any human sagacity to unravel. But yet he could not be unaware of what the fanatical rage of the Jewish zealots threatened, and what it might perpetrate, under the maladministration of the worthless Procurator Felix,* who combined the meanness of a slave with the caprice of a tyrant; at Jerusalem, too, where Might prevailed against Right, and assassins (the notorious Sicarii) acted as the tools of any party who were base enough to employ them. In the churches which he had visited on his journey hither, many individuals had warned him in inspired language of the danger that threatened him at Jerusalem, and thereby confirmed what his own presentiments, as well as his sagacity, led him to expect, similar to those sad anticipations which he expected when he was last at Corinth; Rom. xv. 31.

There are especially two warnings and exhortations relative to the future which he addressed to the overseers of the church, and enforced by the example of his own labours during three years' residence among them.

be any difficulty to Luke or to the persons for whom this memoir was in the first place designed, if a presentiment of Paul's respecting his impending fate was not fulfilled in its full extent. Infallible foreknowledge of future events was certainly, according to the Christian idea of that age, not among the marks of a genuine apostle, and the contrary is rather implied in Paul's own words, v. 22. He speaks in a somewhat dubious tone of the fate that awaited him. Whoever might have forged after the event an address of Paul's, would have made him speak in a very different and more decided tone.

* Of whom Tacitus says; "Per omnem sævitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit." Hist. v. 9.

He foresaw, that false teachers from other parts would insinuate themselves into these churches, and that even among themselves such would arise and gain many adherents.* He exhorts them, therefore, to watch that the doctrine of salvation which he had faithfully published to them for so long a period might be preserved in its purity. The false teachers whom he here pointed out were most probably distinct from the class of common Judaizers; for in churches in which the Gentile Christian, that is, the Hellenic element,* so predominated as in those of Lesser Asia, such persons could not be so dangerous; and particularly when such false teachers were described as proceeding from the bosom of the church itself, it must be presumed that these heretical tendencies must have developed themselves from a mixture with Christianity of the mental elements already existing in the church. Might not Paul's experience during his long stay in Lesser Asia, have given him occasion to feel these anxieties for the future? As immediately after announcing the danger that threatened the church, he reminded them that for three years he had not ceased, day or night, to warn each one among them with tears, we may infer that he had at that time cause thus to address the consciences of their overseers, and to warn them so impressively against the adulteration of Christian truth. We here see the first omens indicated by the apostle of a new conflict which awaited pure Christianity.† At the

* Schneckenburger, p. 136, objects against this remark, that in the Gentile-Christian Galatian churches, Judaizing false teachers could produce the greatest confusion; but the degree of Grecian cultivation in Galatia and at Ephesus makes a difference here.

† As from what is said in the text it is easily shewn, that Paul must have held such a warning of the propagation of new perversions of Christian truth to be called for; so I can find no ground for Baur's and Schneckenburger's assumption, that something is here attributed to Paul which he could not say from his own standing-point; whether with Baur, it is assumed that such a prophesying is formed according to the appearances of a later period, or with Schneckenburger that what was present, what had actually fallen under Paul's own no-

close of his address, Paul refers them to the example of disinterested and self-denying love, which he had given them :—he had required of them neither gold, nor silver, nor raiment, but as they well knew, had provided for his own temporal wants and those of his followers by the labour of his own hands. These words are admirably suited to the close of the address. By reminding the presbyters of the proofs of his disinterested love, and of his zeal which shunned no toil and no privation for the salvation of souls, he gave still greater weight to his exhortations. The 33d verse is closely connected with the 31st, where he reminds them of his labours among them for their souls, and in both verses he holds out his own example for their imitation. He expresses this still more clearly in the words “ I have shewed you all things (or in every way), how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak,* and remember the words of the Lord Jesus,

tice, is here transferred to the future. Schneckenburger finds something intentional in Paul's mentioning nothing of the conflicts which he had sustained with the false teachers, the Judaizers; and in speaking only of such conflicts which would follow his departure. But there certainly lies in Paul's words, a reference to that which he had already said by way of warning to the presbyters. But he could speak of these adulterations of Christianity as future, since he had detected them in the germ, and their further development was at first checked by the power of his personal influence.

* Certainly the *ἀσθενεῖς* in Acts xx. 35, are not those who needed help in respect of their bodily wants; in that case, why should not a more definite word be used? Neither does the connection suit such an interpretation, for Paul does not say that he laboured that he might be able to give to the poor, or that he might support his poor associates; but that the church might not be obliged to contribute neither to them nor to him any thing for their support. And this manifestly in order that every occasion might be taken from the weak, who were not sufficiently established in Christian principles, who would be easily disposed to entertain the suspicion of private advantage. The use of the word *ἀσθενεῖς* in 2 Cor. xi. 29 also favours this interpretation, and what he assigns in both the Epistles to the Corinthians as the reasons of such conduct. Thus also this exhortation stands in closer con-

‘It is more blessed to give than to receive.’” It conveyed the exhortation, that in the discharge of their office they should avoid all appearance of selfishness, that they should rather earn their own livelihood, and give up their claim to what they had a right to expect from the church to which they had consecrated their powers. He impressed this upon them in the most delicate manner, since he does not use the express form of exhortation, but presents his example for imitation under similar circumstances. Paul indeed declares elsewhere, that the preachers of the gospel, as Christ himself had expressed it, were entitled to receive their maintenance from the churches for whose spiritual welfare they laboured. And it may appear strange that he here departs from this rule, and that he should here prescribe to all the presbyters what elsewhere he has represented as an exception arising out of very peculiar circumstances, and as something suited only to his individual standing-point.* But there is a difference between the circumstances of itinerant missionaries and those of the overseers of churches whose activity at first is not so claimed by their pastoral duties as to prevent their carrying on at the same time their former secular employment; and if they thus laboured with self-sacrificing love without any appearance of selfishness, their authority and influence, which would be required to counteract the false teachers, would be much increased.

In this whole address, as suited the feelings and aim of one who was probably taking a last farewell of his spiritual children, the hortatory element is throughout predominant; if we suppose an apologetic element, which is very doubtful, it is at all events quite subordinate to the

nection, with what goes before; for if the presbyters avoided all appearance of selfishness, they would have a firmer hold on the general confidence, and thus, like Paul himself in reference to the Judaizers, could more successfully oppose the false teachers, who endeavoured for their own ends to excite mistrust of the existing teachers and guides of the church.

* For which reason Schneckenburger thinks it improbable that Paul so expressed himself.

former. It is very improbable, that when he spoke of his own disinterestedness, he intended to repel the accusations of his Judaizing adversaries; for though he was obliged to answer such charges in writing to the Corinthians, we are not to infer that a similar exculpation of himself was required in all the churches. With greater reason we may find in what he says of the completeness of his teaching in the doctrines of salvation, a reference to the accusations of his Judaizing opponents, of which we have so often spoken. But even this is very doubtful; for in any case, without an apologetic design, and simply to excite the presbyters to fidelity in holding fast the pure doctrine which they had received, he would of necessity remind them how important he had felt it to keep back nothing from them that was necessary for salvation, and that he was free from blame if, after all, they should be guilty of unfaithfulness.

Such an address could not but make a deep impression on their hearts, of which we have a simple and striking description in the Acts **xxi.** 37-38.

When Paul arrived at Cæsarea Stratonis, within two days' journey of Jerusalem, he was warned of fresh dangers that threatened him. The members of the church and his companions united their entreaties that he would be careful of his life, and not proceed any further. But though he was far from the enthusiastic zeal that panted for martyrdom, though he never neglected any methods of Christian prudence, in order to preserve his life for the service of his Lord and of the Church, yet, as he himself declared, he counted his life as nothing, if required to sacrifice it in the ministry entrusted to him. However much a heart so tenderly susceptible, so open to all pure human emotions as his, must have been moved by the tears of his friends, who loved him as their spiritual father, yet he suffered not his resolution to be shaken, but resisted all these impressions, in order to follow the call of duty; he left all events to the will of the Lord, in which at last his Christian brethren concurred.

The next day after his arrival at Jerusalem, Paul

with his companions visited James the brother of the Lord, at whose house the presbyters of the church were assembled. They listened with great interest to his account of the effects of the gospel among the Gentiles. But James called his attention to the fact, that a great number of Jews who believed on Jesus as the Messiah, and were yet zealous and strict observers of the Mosaic law, were prejudiced against him ;* for those Judaizers,

* Dr Baur has attempted to shew, that the words in Acts xxi. 20, "*οἱ ἰουδαῖοι*" are a gloss, and that the Jews here spoken of are those who had not received the gospel. It appears to him incredible, that the number of Christians among the Jews, who in later times were confined to the small sects of the Ebionites and Nazarenes, could have been so very great. He thinks, that what James said would perfectly apply to Jews who had not yet embraced the gospel, of whose plots it behoved Paul to be careful, and who afterwards actually raised a tumult against him. Origen indeed says, *Tom. I. in Joh.* § 2, that the number of believing Jews in the whole world would not amount to one hundred and forty-four thousand ; but from the times of Origen we cannot draw an inference respecting an earlier period. Since Christianity had for a long time spread so successfully among the Jews, their numbers in the course of twenty years might have increased to several myriads, as Hegesippus likewise testifies in Eusebius ii. 23 ; and we need not confine the expression to Jews resident in Jerusalem, since at the Pentecost many would be brought together from other parts. But many of these believing Jews might not distinguish themselves from others, excepting by the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, and hence we may account for many of them relapsing into Judaism, when their own Messianic expectations were not fulfilled. We also find no intimation that James had warned Paul of danger threatening him from this class of Jews ; but he only required that he would seek to regain the confidence of these brethren in the faith, who were filled with mistrust and suspicion towards him. The connection of verse 20, absolutely requires the addition of "*οἱ ἰουδαῖοι*," for how could James be supposed to tell Paul a fact he well knew beforehand, that at Jerusalem there were so many myriads of Jews, who were all zealous observers of the law ! Baur in his review of Schneckenburger's work has acknowledged that this alteration of the text formerly proposed by him, is untenable ; but attempts to

who every where sought to injure Paul's ministry, had circulated in Jerusalem the charge against him, that, not content with releasing the believing Gentiles from the observance of the Mosaic law, he had required of the Jews who lived among them not to circumcise their children, and not to observe the law. This charge, so brought forward, was certainly false; for Paul combated the outward observance of Judaism only so far as the justification and sanctification of men were made to depend upon it. It was his principle, that no one should relinquish the national and civil relations in which he stood at his conversion, unless for important reasons; and on this principle he allowed the Jews to retain their peculiarities, among which was the observance of the Mosaic law; 1 Cor. vii. 18. But it could not fail to happen, that those who entered into the Pauline ideas of the relation of the

solve the difficulty which he here believes to exist, by another method in connection with the views held by himself and Schneckenburger respecting the peculiar standing-point and object of the Acts. Historical truth must here make her way through the subjective point of view, into which the author of the Acts forces every thing, and assert her right even against his will. He wished, forsooth, so to represent matters, as if, by the arrangement agreed upon by the apostolic convention at Jerusalem, the differences between the Jewish and Gentile Christians had been settled, and Paul henceforward had to combat, not with Jewish Christians, but solely with Jews. Yet against his will he was obliged to grant to historical truth, that in the machinations against Paul on his last visit to Jerusalem, the Jewish Christians had the principal share. But as this is opposed to the point of view on which he proceeds every where else, the subjective and the objective are so mingled by him, that the Jewish Christians become Jews again, and hence he is led into the error of overrating the numbers of the former. But after what has been said, we cannot accede to the correctness of this too artificial hypothesis. And if the author had once allowed himself to distort history according to his subjective point of view, he would surely have remained faithful to this view, and on this last occasion would have named only Jews as the calumniators of Paul, against whose false accusations he would have to justify himself. He was under no necessity by such inconsistency to testify against himself.

law to the gospel, and were thereby freed from scrupulosity in the observance of the former, were led into a freer line of conduct in this respect, and some might go further than Paul wished in the indulgence of their inclinations. Such instances as these, might have given occasion to the charge that he had seduced the Jewish Christians to release themselves from the law.* As by

* Dr Schneckenburger and Baur think that the manner in which this transaction is mentioned in the Acts, is an important confirmation of their views of the whole history. The mode of acting here ascribed to Paul, appears to them totally irreconcilable with the principles he lays down in his epistles. According to Schneckenburger, the Acts would be a confused, partial representation of a real transaction, sketched according to a subjective point of view lying at its basis; according to Baur, it would be an entirely false narration. Either (in the opinion of the latter) the historical credibility of the Acts must be given up, or the character of Paul must stand in an unfavourable light. I will here cite Baur's words: "If it were really so, as the author of the Acts represents the fact, that the apostle, as *φυλάσων τον νομον*, became the object of an intensely vehement persecution, with what right can we oppose the language of the apostle to all who think they can defend the perfect historic credibility of the Acts, in Gal v. 11, 'Ιγω δε, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περιτομὴν ἵτι κηρύσσω, τί ἵτι διώκομαι; ἄρα καταργηταὶ τοῦ σκαυδαλοῦ,' and the same apostle, who in Gal. v. 3, declares in so solemn a tone, 'μαρτυροῦμαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτιμνομένῳ, ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τον νομον ποιῆσαι,' (therefore must place his whole trust in the law, and expect salvation from it alone), must, according to the Acts (xxi. 23) have consented to an act which represented him as a *φυλάσων τον νομον*, and bore public testimony that, so far from abrogating the law, he was rather a teacher of it, who taught as much as others this universal obligation of the Mosaic law with all its ordinances, and especially that of circumcision, (xxi. 23). That in Acts xxi. 21, only the *Ιουδαῖοι κατὰ τὰ εἶδη* are spoken of, makes not the least difference. Had the apostle also wished to give up nothing respecting the continual validity of the law, only among the Jews whom he sought to convert to Christianity, as he practically declared in Acts xxi. 26, compared with 23, with what untruth would he have expressed himself to the Galatians!" But I cannot perceive the alleged contradiction between this mode of acting and the prin-

this accusation, the conduct of Paul would be presented in a false light, and since he was far from being such an

ciples expressed by Paul. Such a contradiction appears only when they are separated, and not viewed in connection with his whole style of thinking. In all those passages in which he so emphatically speaks against circumcision and the observance of the ceremonial law, every thing is referred to the standing-point of those who were Gentiles by birth, among whom nothing of the kind was founded in their historical development, or in their national institutions. It was not circumcision in itself, it was not the observance of the Mosaic ritual in itself, which he so strenuously opposed. He never attached so much importance to outward things either negatively or positively; these he always declared were in themselves indifferent, and impressively said that neither circumcision availed any thing, nor uncircumcision, but that all depended on the new creation, which must be effected equally in the circumcised and uncircumcised by the Spirit of Christ; Gal. vi. 15. It was the same thing whether a man lived as a Jew or a Gentile, provided, under these different forms of national culture, he was actuated by the same spirit of faith in Jesus as the Saviour working by love; Gal. v. 6. As that which he considered of most importance in life as the principle of the new Christian creation was only this one thing, so that which he so strenuously combated was only that one thing which stood in opposition to this principle, and exactly as far as it was thus in opposition. But among Gentile Christians, the outward act or rite, and the principle on which it rested, the reason for practising it, were alike nugatory; it was something contradictory to their national character,—it was the introduction of a foreign element into the course of their religious development,—and they could be brought to submit to such a burdensome ceremonial, only on the supposition that it had a favourable influence on their relation to God. It is therefore evident, that the principles which Paul expressed on the outward observance of the Mosaic law in reference to Gentile Christians, were totally inapplicable to Jewish Christians. The sense of the words in Gal. v. 11, is, If Paul now, as an apostle (as formerly from his Pharisaic standing-point), taught that no one could obtain salvation without circumcision,—that the Gentiles, in order to be admitted to the privileges of the Messianic kingdom, must submit to circumcision,—then the Jews would have no reason for persecuting him; his object would be the same as that of the

enemy to Judaism as his adversaries wished him to appear, he declared himself to be ready, as James proposed,

Jewish proselyte-makers, to convert all men to Judaism. The doctrine of Jesus the Crucified was so obnoxious to the Jews, because they were compelled by it to renounce all their self-righteousness, every thing in which they seemed to take precedence of the Gentiles. If it were admitted that the Gentiles must first become Jews, in order to be on an equality with the Jews as citizens of the kingdom of God, this stone of offence would be taken away. But if Paul allowed the Jews to continue in their outward manner of life as Jews, and in this respect acted himself like a Jew, this was something very different from *πιστοὺς κηρύττειν* in the former sense. According to the Pauline doctrine, the position that, equally for Jews and Gentiles, men are freed by Christ from the yoke of the law, is constantly valid. This refers to the internal relation to the law, and the position of the religious consciousness to it. But notwithstanding this truth, the Jewish Christians might retain the outward observance of the law. Has not Paul himself, in 1 Cor. vii. 18-20, plainly expressed the principle? the Jews after their conversion are to continue Jews; Christianity requires no one to make a change on these outward things, on which the essence of religion does not depend. When he says in 1 Cor. ix. 20, that to the Jews he became a Jew, that he appeared as one subject to the law, can this have any other sense than that among the Jews he lived as a Jew, so that if any one looked only at what was external, he must have supposed that Paul was still subject to the yoke of the law, still held it to be binding? Must we not, from what he here asserts of himself, conclude with certainty, though we had no historical data, that he acted in several instances exactly as we find described in the Acts? But it may be said, If Paul took a part in the observance of such a Nazarite's vow, he thereby practically sanctioned the notion, that it was something acceptable in itself to God, and conducive to salvation. If this had been the case, such practices must have been recommended to the Gentile Christians in general as well pleasing to God. But as Paul, under all circumstances, expressed the same principle, that by the works of the law no one can be justified before God,—as he always insisted that the Gentile Christians, though they observed none of these things, ought to be acknowledged as members of the kingdom of God on an equality with the Jews,—as those who desired him to practise such an outward observance of Jewish rites, agreed with him

to refute that charge by an overt act, by taking part in the Jewish cultus in a mode which was highly esteemed by pious Jews.* He joined himself to four members of the church, who had undertaken a Nazarite's vow for seven days. He submitted to the same restraints, and intimated to the priests that he would be answerable for the expense of the offerings that were to be presented on the accomplishment of the purification.† But though

in his leading principle,—he sufficiently guarded himself against the false conclusion which might have been deduced from a misapprehension of his conduct. Those who merely observed externally the different conduct of the apostles among the Jews and Gentiles, must indeed believe that they had detected an inconsistency; and we have already noticed what imputations were cast upon him by his adversaries on this account. Indeed, when James says of Paul "that he walked orderly and kept the law," Acts xxi. 24, we must understand it with the necessary limitation, that the same Paul had no scruple to live among the Gentiles as a Gentile. But the author of the Acts reports only single facts; we find not an assumption of consecutiveness and comprehensiveness in his history, but a want of these qualities altogether in his apostolic memoirs.

* Josephus, *Archæol.* xix. 6, § 1.

† The common supposition that Paul joined himself to these Nazarenes, when they had yet seven days, Acts xxi. 27, to continue their abstinence for the discharge of their vow, and that during this time he kept the vow with them, is at variance with the mention of twelve days, Acts xxiv. 11, for in that case there must have been seventeen days. It is indeed in itself possible, that Paul did not reckon the five days which he spent in confinement at Cæsarea, since they signified nothing for his object; but it does not appear so from his own words. There remains, therefore, nothing else but to assume, that the seven days denote a definite number of days, to which at that time the Nazarites' vow used to extend, and that Paul had joined the Nazarites on one of the last of these days. But, on the other hand, in the section of the Mishnah on the Nazarites' vow, the number of thirty days is mentioned as the fixed term for this oath. As to the seven days mentioned in Numbers vi., they are not applicable to the present case; for they refer to the case of a person who, during the time of his vow, has defiled himself, and who, after the interval of seven days' purification, begins his vow afresh.

he might have satisfied by this means the minds of the better disposed among the Jewish Christians, the inveterate zealots among the Jews were not at all conciliated.* On the contrary, they were only more incensed, that the man who, as they said, had every where taught the Gentiles to blaspheme the people of God, the Law and the Temple, had ventured to take a part in the Jewish cultus. They had seen a Gentile Christian, Trophimus, in company with him, and hence the fanatics concluded that he had taken a Gentile with him into the temple and defiled it. A violent tumult instantly arose, and Paul was rescued from the enraged multitude only by means of the Roman tribune, who hastened to the spot with a band of soldiers from the *Ars Antonia* situated over against the temple, the quarters of the Roman garrison. x

Paul was on the point of being scourged, (a common mode of torture among the Romans,) for the purpose of extorting a confession respecting the cause of this tumult, but by declaring himself a Roman citizen he was saved from this ignominy. The tribune now endeavoured to ascertain the facts of the case, that he might send Paul to appear before the Sanhedrim. The manner in which the apostle conducted himself on this occasion, shews him to have been a man who knew how to control the agitation of his feelings by a sober judgment, and to avail himself of circumstances with Christian prudence, without any compromise of truth. When he was suddenly carried away by the impulse of righteous indignation to speak with greater warmth than he intended, he was able to recover the mastery of his feelings, and to act in a manner becoming his vocation. In a moment

* I find no reason for assuming with Baur, that the machinations against Paul proceeded chiefly from the Jewish Christians, and to charge the author of the Acts with falsifying a matter of fact. But I consider it possible that, among the great multitude of Jewish Christians, some might be found to whom their Judaism was more important than the little Christianity they possessed, and that such persons would make common cause with the Jewish zealots against Paul.

of excitement at the arbitrary conduct of the high priest Ananias, while thinking only of the person and losing sight of the office whose duties had been violated, he had used intemperate expressions though containing truth; but on being informed that it was the high priest whom he had so addressed, he at once corrected himself and said, he had not considered the dignity of the person he had thus addressed, to whom reverence was due according to the law.* In order to secure the voice of the majority among his judges, he availed himself of that means for the victory of truth, which has often been used against it—the *divide et impera* in a good sense; he enlisted on his side the bias for that truth by the acknowledgment of which the greater number of his judges really approached nearer to him, than the few who denied it, in order to produce a division in the assembly. He could say with truth, that he was brought to trial because he had testified of the hope of Israel, and of the resurrection of the dead, for he had preached Jesus as the personage by whom this hope was fulfilled. These words had the effect of uniting the Pharisees present in his favour, and of involving them in a warm debate with the Sadducees, to whom the high priest himself belonged. The former could find no fault in him. If he had said that the spirit of a deceased person or that an angel had appeared to him—(the appearance of the risen Jesus)—whatever he might mean by this, and whether what he averred, were true or not, they did not pretend to determine, nor trouble themselves about it;—at all events, they could not criminate him on this account.† The

* If we are not disposed to think of the meaning of *ἐπὶ*, Acts xxiii. 5, in the language which probably Paul used on this occasion, the Aramaic, the meaning which *ܕܢܐ* may well have; yet it is plain from the circumstances under which he said this, that he could not, in the strict sense of the word, affirm that he did not know him.

† The words "*οὐκ ᾔδειν ὅτι ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἔμελλεν εἶναι ὁ ἀντιθέτων*," Acts xxiii. 9, are certainly a gloss, and a gloss at variance with the general tenor of the passage, for this was certainly more than the Pharisees could be willing to say from their standing-point.

tribune of the Roman cohort, at last saw himself obliged by the plots of Paul's enemies against his life, to send him under an escort to the metropolis of the province Cæsarea, and to transfer the affair to the Procurator Felix, who resided there.

The accusation which the Sanhedrim by their counsel were allowed to bring against him, was the only one which, according to the privileges secured to the Jews by the Roman laws, could with any show of reason be made, namely, that he every where disturbed the Jews in the enjoyment of these privileges, the peaceful exercise of their cultus,—that he excited disturbances and divisions among them, and that at last he had dared to desecrate the temple. The Tribune was accused of preventing the Jews from judging Paul according to the privileges secured to them by law. Felix, who was not disposed to meddle with the internal disputes of the Jews, perceived no fault in the accused, and hence would at once have set him at liberty, if he had not hoped, as it was his practice to make justice venal, to obtain money from him ; but as Paul was not willing to purchase his freedom by such an unlawful method, which would cast suspicion both on himself and his cause, Felix, in order to gain favour with the Jews on leaving them, to whom he had been sufficiently obnoxious, left him in confinement, and thus he remained for two years till the arrival of the new Procurator, M. Porcius Festus.*

* If the precise time at which Felix was recalled, and Festus received the government of the province, could be exactly determined, we should have an important chronological mark ; but this period cannot be so exactly determined. The chronological data on which we here proceed, are the following. When Felix laid down the procuratorship, he was accused at Rome, as Josephus (*Archæol.* xx. 8, § 9) relates, by the Jews, on account of the oppressions he had practised, and would have been punished if he had not been delivered by the intercession of his brother Pallas, who at that time had much influence with the Emperor. But Pallas was poisoned by Nero in the year 62, see Tacit. *Annal.* xiv. 65. This enables us to fix the extreme *terminus a quo* of the recall of Felix. But according to the narrative of Tacitus, Pallas

Paul had for a long time previous to this event entertained the thought of preaching the gospel in the metropolis of the world. But it was now uncertain whether he would ever attain the fulfilment of this inward call; but on the night after he had borne testimony to his faith before the assembled Sanhedrim, the Lord imparted the assurance to him by a vision, that as he had been his witness in the capital of the Jewish world, he should also be the same in that of the Gentile world. It was

had long before lost his influence, (Annal. xiii. 14). At the beginning of his reign, Nero had removed Pallas from the office he held under Claudius, and treated him with displeasure. And since Josephus says that when Pallas interceded for his brother Felix he stood in favour with the Emperor, it follows, that the recall of Felix must have taken place in the beginning of Nero's reign, which can by no means be admitted. What Josephus says in the history of his life, of his own journey to Rome in his six and twentieth year, gives no sure foundation for determining the time when Felix laid down his office. Schrader thinks indeed, that he can find a certain chronological mark in this, that something which Josephus puts in connection with the entrance of Festus into office, was decided by the influence of Poppæa, already married to Nero, (*Joseph. Archæol.* xx. 8, § 1); for it would follow that since Nero, according to Tacitus, married Poppæa in 62, Festus must have entered on his government about this time. But the words of Josephus xiv. 60, *κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐξουσίαν* cannot avail for exactly determining the time; Poppæa, long before her marriage to Nero, had great influence over him, as appears from the words of Tacitus, Annal. xiv. 60, "Ea diri pellex et adulteri Neronis, mox mariti potens," and had already accomplished much by interceding with the emperor. We need not attach much weight to the circumstance that Josephus calls her at that time the wife of Nero. But in all this much uncertainty attaches to the chronology of events, and the supposition that Felix laid down his office in the year 62, and therefore that Paul's confinement took place in 60, is by no means sufficiently proved. We may therefore, safely place it some years earlier. If Paul was set at liberty from his confinement at Rome, we must necessarily admit the earlier date; for if his confinement at Rome had been contemporaneous with the great conflagration, he would certainly have fallen a sacrifice to the fury then excited against the Christians.

this which confirmed him in his resolution, when the Procurator was about to sacrifice him to the wishes of the Jewish Sanhedrim, of seeking deliverance by an appeal to the Emperor. The arrival at Cæsarea of the young King Agrippa II, as a person acquainted with the Jews and their religion, was acceptable to Festus, since he hoped that, by admitting Paul to an examination in his presence, he could learn something more decisive in this affair, which might be communicated in his report to Rome. Paul appeared before so numerous and august an assembly, before the Roman Procurator and the Jewish King, with exultation at the thought of being able to testify of what filled his heart before such an audience. He addressed himself especially to King Agrippa; in whom, as a professor of the Jewish faith, he hoped to find more points of connection than in a heathen magistrate. He narrated how he had been educated in zealous attachment to Pharisaic principles, and from a violent persecutor had, by a call from the Lord himself, become a devoted preacher of the gospel,—that in obeying this call up to that time he had testified before Jews and Gentiles, great and small, but had published nothing else than what Moses and the Prophets had foretold, that the Messiah should suffer, that he should rise from the dead, and by the assurance of an everlasting divine life diffuse light among Jews and Gentiles. This he might presume was admitted by the King as an acknowledged article of faith, but it must appear utterly strange to the Romans; strange also must the religious inspiration with which Paul uttered all this appear to the cold-hearted Roman statesman. He could see nothing in it but enthusiastic delusion. "Too much Jewish learning," he exclaimed, "hath made thee mad." But with calm confidence Paul replied, "I am not mad, but speak the words of truth and soberness!" and, turning to Agrippa, he called upon him as a witness, since he well knew that these things were not done in a corner of the earth, in secret, but publicly at Jerusalem. And with a firm conviction, that in all he had testified the promises of the prophets were fulfilled, he said to the King,

"Believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest!" Agrippa, offended by Paul's confidence, answered, "Truly in a short time* thou wilt make me a Christian." Paul, with his fetters on his arm, was conscious of possessing more than all the glory of the world, uttered the noble words, "Yes, I pray God that in a longer or a shorter time, he would make not only thee, O King, but all who hear me to-day, what I now am, except these bonds!"

As the King and the Procurator after this examination could not find Paul guilty of any offence punishable by the laws, the Procurator would probably have set him at liberty, if after his appeal to Cæsar it had not been necessary for the matter to take its legal course; yet the report (*elogium*) with which he would be sent to Rome, could not be otherwise than in his favour. The centurion to whom he was committed with other prisoners in order to be taken to Rome, certainly corroborated the impression of this favourable report by the account he gave of Paul's conduct during his long and dangerous voyage. Hence he met at Rome with more indulgent treatment than the other prisoners: he was allowed to hire a private dwelling in which only one soldier attended him as a guard, to whom he was fastened by a chain on the arm (the usual mode of the *custodia militaris*), and could receive all who were disposed to visit him and write letters.

* I understand the words *ἔτι* (Acts xxvi. 28) in the only sense which they can have according to the *usus loquendi* and Paul's answer. The interpretation adopted by Meyer and some others is indeed possible, but appears to me not so natural. If the reading of the Cod. Alex. and of the Vulgate, which Lachmann approves, be adopted, *ἔτι μικρόν*, in Paul's answer, the words of Agrippa must be thus explained, "With a little, or with few reasons (which will not cost you much trouble) you think of making me a Christian"—and the answer of Paul will be, Whether with great or with little—for many or few reasons, I pray God, &c. But I cannot make up my mind to receive as correct this reading which may be explained as a gloss, and is not supported by very preponderating authorities.

As he had cause to fear that the Jews dwelling at Rome had received from Jerusalem a report inimical to his character, and regarded him as an accuser of his people, he endeavoured speedily to remove this unfavourable impression. Accordingly, three days after his arrival, he invited the principal persons among them to visit him. It proved that no report to Paul's prejudice had yet reached them, if it be allowed that they spoke the truth. It also appeared from the statements of these respectable Jews, that they had heard little or nothing of the Christian church which existed in the same city with themselves. Nor is this inconceivable, if we only consider the immense size of the metropolis, and the vast confluence of human beings it contained, and if to this we add, that the main body of that church consisted of Gentiles, and that these wealthy Jews busied themselves far more about other objects than about the concerns of religion. Yet it by no means appears from the statements of the Jews that they had scarcely heard of a Christian church existing at Rome, but only that they had not taken any pains to acquire an accurate knowledge of it. They knew indeed that this new sect met every where with opponents, and hence it might be inferred that they had heard of the controversies which had been carried on at Rome about it, for the "every where" (*παραχού*), in Acts xxviii. 22, includes (certainly does not exclude) a reference to what was going on at Rome itself, and we must not forget that only the substance of what the Jews said is handed down to us.* As they heard much of the opposition excited against this new sect, but nothing precise respecting their doctrines, they were well pleased that Paul proposed to give them an address on the subject. But here, as every where else, Paul's preaching found more acceptance with the Gentiles than with the Jews.†

* I cannot find any foundation for the contradiction which Dr Baur, in his treatises so often quoted, thinks he has detected between this narration in the Acts, and the existence of such a church at Rome, which we must suppose according to Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

† The position developed and advocated with equal acute-

With the confinement of Paul, a new and important era commenced not only in his life and ministry, but

ness and learning by H. Bottger in the second part of his "*Beiträge zur historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die paulinischen Briefe*, Göttingen 1837,—that Paul was a prisoner only for the first three or five days after his arrival in Rome, that he then obtained his freedom, and lived for two years in a hired house, quite at liberty;—this position, if it were true, would cast a new light on Paul's history during this period; for it would then appear that all those Epistles, which evidently were written during some one imprisonment, could not have been written at Rome or during his first confinement there. But the narrative in the Acts is directly opposed to this supposition. I cannot understand Acts xxviii. 16, otherwise than that permission was then granted to Paul to reside in a private house, the same which is designated in v. 23, his lodging, *ἐνοικία*, and in v. 30, as *τὴν μισθώματι*, "his own hired house." It cannot be imagined, that if, after three days, so important an alteration had taken place in Paul's circumstances, Luke would not have mentioned it, for the assertion that his readers must have supposed this of themselves, from the known forms of Roman justice, cannot satisfy us. Even if this could have been supposed, he would hardly have omitted to point out in a few words so important a change in Paul's lot. But it is not easily proved that such an inference could be drawn, from what is known respecting the course of Roman justice at that time. The manner also in which Luke expresses himself (Acts xxviii. 30, 31) respecting Paul's residence for two years at Rome, certainly implies that he had not then obtained his freedom, for we are merely told that he preached the gospel in his own dwelling; but it is not narrated that he visited the synagogue or any place where the church met, for which omission no other reason can be given, than that, although he could receive any visit in his own residence, under the inspection of his guard, he was not at liberty to go to whatever place he chose; and least of all, would a prisoner, whose cause was not yet decided, have been permitted to attend these meetings of the church, even if accompanied by his guard. Here, therefore, we have a fact which cannot be explained, unless we admit the continued confinement of Paul. How likewise can it be imagined, that Paul, who wished to visit the church at Rome only on his way, would have stayed there for two years, where suitable measures had already been taken for the continued propagation of Christianity, instead of travelling to those regions of

also in the development of the churches founded by him, for in proportion as Christianity spread more widely, a number of heterogeneous mental elements were brought into action, many important phenomena became conspicuous, while the divine word operated among them in an independent manner, and they were deprived of the apostle's personal oversight and guidance.

the West, where nothing had yet been done for making known the gospel? This is explicable only on the supposition, that he remained so long a time at Rome *under constraint*.

According to the account in the Acts, we may receive it as an established fact, that Paul lived two years in Rome as a prisoner,—a fact which can be overturned by nothing that we know of the course of Roman justice in the case of such appeals; even without waiting to examine how both could be reconciled to one another.

Meanwhile, from what is known of the legal processes in the time of the first Cæsars, it can by no means be proved, what is in the highest degree improbable, that all the causes which, in consequence of an appeal, were brought to Rome for decision, were decided in the course of five or ten days. It was one thing to decide on the admissibility of the appeal, and another thing to decide on the point of law respecting which the appeal was made. My respected colleague Professor Rudorff, who has had the goodness to make me a written communication on this subject, concludes with the statement, that the term of five or ten days related not to the duration of the judicial proceedings, but to the lodging of the appeal, and to the *apostoli* (= *literæ dimissoriæ*), that it gave no prescription relative to the term of the transaction itself, and that the accused remained under arrest till the decision of the Emperor. Thus, in the *Sententiis Receptis* of Julius Paulus, lib. v. tit. 34, it is said expressly of the *apostolis*, "Quorum postulatio et acceptio intra quintum diem ex officio facienda est." In a law enacted by the Emperor Constantine in 314, according to which we are not justified in determining the legal process in the times of the first Cæsars, is the express provision that the *appellator* should be free from arrest only in *causas civiles*, but of *criminalibus causis* it is said, "In quibus, etiamsi possunt provocare, eum tamen statim deberit obtinere, ut post provocationem in custodia perseverent." Cod. Theodos. lib. xi. tit. 30, c. 2.

CHAPTER IX.

PAUL DURING HIS FIRST CONFINEMENT AT ROME, AND THE DEVELOPMENT DURING THE SAME PERIOD OF THE CHURCHES PREVIOUSLY FOUNDED BY HIM.

IN examining this portion of Paul's history, we must fix our attention on three principal points; his relation to the Roman state—to the Church at Rome,—and to the Churches in other parts.

With respect to the first, the main thing to be considered is, from what point of view the charge under which he was detained as a prisoner is to be viewed? Christianity was not yet denounced as a *religio illicita*, therefore Paul could not, like the later teachers of Christianity, be accused of violating the laws of the state, on account of his exertions in propagating this religion. Christians appeared only as a sect proceeding from Judaism, who were accused by Paul's Jewish adversaries of adulterating the original doctrines of their religion; so that at Rome no attention was paid to disputes that merely concerned the religious institutions of the Jews. This charge against Paul might therefore be considered as altogether foreign to Roman judicature, and he would soon regain his liberty; in this manner, the affair would soon be brought to a close; but it cannot be shewn, that it would be viewed under this aspect, the most favourable for the apostle. The Jews might accuse him as being a disturber of the public peace, who interfered with the privileges guaranteed to them by the Roman Government, as their advocate Tertullus had already attempted to prove. Hence an additional allegation might be made, which from the standing-point of the Roman law would tend much more to Paul's injury—that he had caused among other Roman subjects and citizens in the provinces, and in Rome itself, movements which were detrimental to the good order of the state, that he had tempted them to apostatize from the state religion, by propa-

gating a religion at variance with the ancient Roman institutions, in which religion and politics were intimately blended.* If the church at Rome, consisting mainly of Gentile Christians, gave the impression in its whole appearance of being unjewish, in short, a *genus tertium*; this view of Paul's conduct would be formed so much the more easily. The existence of this new religious sect in the capital, would be made an object of public attention by the proceedings against Paul. We may suppose, that his fanatical and artful adversaries among the Jews, would leave no artifice untried to set his conduct in the worst possible light to the Roman authorities. Thus the investigation of his cause, with the accusation and defence, might be protracted, and his prospects might by turns become favourable or unfavourable. During the first period of his residence at Rome he underwent no public examination.† His situation justified the most favourable expectations, and he proposed when set at liberty, before he extended his sphere of labour towards the West, according to the plan he had previously formed, to visit Lesser Asia, where his personal exertions seemed to be very necessary to counteract many influences that were operating injuriously on the churches. He intimated to the overseer of the church at Colossæ, Philemon, that he intended to take up his abode with him.

At a later period‡ of his imprisonment, when he had

* The point of view as a Roman statesman from which Cicero formed his model of law. "Separatim nemo habessit Deos neve novos sive advenas, nisi publice adscitos privatim colunto. *Ritus familiæ patrumque servant.*" *Cicero de Legibus*; and in the Commentaries, c. x., against the *confusio religionum*, which arose from the introduction of foreign new religions. This was the point of view from which a Tacitus and the Younger Pliny formed their judgment of Christianity.

† Whether this term embraced the whole of the first two years of his confinement we cannot with certainty determine, for the silence of Luke in the Acts is not a sufficient proof that, during the whole of this period, there was nothing memorable to be narrated respecting the situation of the apostle.

‡ As appears from his Epistle to the Philippians.

already undergone a public examination, he had no such favourable prospect before him ; the thought of martyrdom became familiar to his mind, yet the expectation of being released from confinement was predominant, so that he wrote to the church at Philippi that he hoped to come to them soon. But if the view we have taken of the origin and original constitution of the church at Rome be correct, a close connection and intimate communion may be presumed to have existed between its members and the individual whom they might regard mediately as their spiritual Father, and whose peculiar form of doctrine prevailed among them. Now if the epistles which Paul wrote during his first confinement at Rome bore evidence against such a supposition, they might also be adduced against our views. If these epistles make us acquainted with any difference existing between the Roman church and Paul, this fact would be very decisive, and we should be forced to conclude that a strongly marked Judaizing element predominated in that church. But the Roman Christians had already, even before he arrived at Rome, evinced their sympathy, since several of their number travelled a day's journey, as far as the small town of *Forum Appii*, and some a shorter distance to the place called *Tres Tabernæ*, in order to meet him. In the Epistle to the Philippians he sends salutation from the *whole* church (*πᾶσι ἐν ἑκκλῆσι*), which is a proof of the close connection in which he stood with them. As to his giving special salutations from the Christians in the service of the Imperial Palace (the *Cæsariani*), we are not to infer that these persons were more in unison with him than the rest of the church, but rather that they were better acquainted, and on more intimate terms with the church at Philippi. At all events, it is an arbitrary supposition that these Gentile Christians were those who, in distinction from the rest of the church, consisting of Jewish Christians, were in closer connection with Paul. It might indeed be expected, that if these *Cæsariani* were more

* See Schneckenburger, p. 123.

allied by their Gentile origin to the church at Philippi, he would have mentioned this circumstance as the reason for presenting their special salutations. It is not at all inconsistent with this view, if these epistles contain undeniable marks, that in the Roman church Judaizers were found hostile to Paul and who occasioned him much vexation; for we ourselves have pointed out a Judaizing tendency in a smaller part of this church sufficient to account for such an appearance. As the Gentile Christians who advocated the Pauline principles, now found so important a support in his personal presence, and co-operated with him in publishing the gospel among the Gentiles, the opposition of the Judaizing antipauline party must have been excited by it and rendered still more violent. The whole tone of the Epistle to the Philippians testifies of the conflicts he sustained in his intercourse with the Judaizers. His excited feelings cannot be mistaken; his displeasure was called forth by anxiety for the purity of the gospel against those who, where the soil appeared in a fit state for receiving the gospel, sought to take advantage of it for gaining adherents for their Jewish ceremonies and doctrine of meritorious works. And Paul himself distinguishes those among the Roman Christians who, with friendly feelings towards himself, were active in co-operating with him for the spread of the gospel, from those who, animated with jealousy at his success, endeavoured to form a party against him, and to "add affliction to his bonds," Phil. i. 15-18; and among the Jewish Christians he could only point out two who laboured with him for the kingdom of God, and contributed to his comfort; Col. iv. 11.

During his confinement, anxiety for the extension of the kingdom of God, and for the prosperity of the churches he had founded, occupied him far more than the care of his personal welfare. As all persons had free access to him, he thus enjoyed opportunities for preaching the gospel. By the soldiers who relieved one another in standing guard over him, it became known among their comrades, (among the *cohortes prætorianæ*, in the *castra prætoriana*, in the *prætorium*); and hence to a wider ex-

tent in the city, that he was put in confinement, not on account of any civil offence, but for his zeal on behalf of the new religion; and this tended to promote it, since a cause for which its advocate sacrificed every thing was certain of attracting attention. By his example also many of the Roman Christians were roused to publish the truth zealously and boldly. But while some co-operated with Paul in a oneness of heart and mind, others came forward who belonged to the antipauline Judaizing party, in opposition to his method of publishing the gospel. The manner in which he expresses himself respecting these his opponents is worthy of notice on two accounts. We here see a man who could entirely forget his own person when the cause of his Lord was concerned,—who could even rejoice in what bore an unfriendly aspect towards himself, if it contributed to promote the cause of Christ. We perceive how far his zeal for the truth and against error was from all selfish contractedness; with what freedom of spirit he was able to pass a judgment on all doctrinal differences. Even in the erroneous views of these Judaizers he acknowledged the truth that lay at their basis; and when he compared the errors propagated by them, with the fundamental truth which they announced at the same time, it was still a cause of joy to him that this fundamental truth was becoming more generally known, that in every way, whether in pretence (by those who in their hearts preferred Judaism to Christianity), or with an upright intention, Christ was preached, Phil. i. 18. For even by these persons the knowledge of the facts on which the gospel rested was spread to a greater extent; and where faith in Jesus as the Messiah, the founder and king of the kingdom of God, was once produced, on this foundation a superstructure could be raised of more correct and extended instruction. But from this we learn what is of service for explaining later appearances in the history of the Roman church, that in connection with the lessons of the Pauline theology the germ of a Judaizing tendency was implanted in this church.

The concerns of the churches in Lesser Asia first oc-

cupied Paul's attention in his imprisonment.* He had received an exact account of their situations from an eminent individual belonging to the church of Colossæ, Epaphras, the founder of that and of the neighbouring Christian communities. He visited Paul at Rome, and

* The supposition on which we here proceed, that Paul wrote the Epistles to the Colossians, the Ephesians, and Philemon, during this confinement at Rome, has found in later times strenuous opponents in Schulz and Schott, to whom must be added Böttger; but the arguments advanced by them against it do not appear to me adapted to overthrow the opinion hitherto most generally held, though no demonstrative proof can be given in its favour, since Paul does not exactly state the circumstances under which he wrote. What he says of the opportunities presented for announcing the gospel, agree very well with what we know of his confinement at Rome, from the hints given in the Acts and in the Epistle to the Philippians. (The latter indeed cannot be urged against Böttger, for he supposes that epistle to be written while Paul was confined at Cæsarea.) It does not appear to me surprising, that a runaway slave from Colossæ should betake himself at once to Rome; for the constant intercourse with the capital of the empire would easily furnish him with an opportunity, and he might hope for greater security from the distance and the immense population of the metropolis. Nor is it at all strange, that a teacher of the church at Colossæ should be induced, by the dangers that threatened pure Christianity there, to travel as far as Rome in order to consult the apostle, and to solicit his assistance; though we cannot determine with certainty whether other personal concerns also brought Epaphras to Rome. Neither can the fact that Paul, when at Rome, desired a lodging to be in readiness for him at Colossæ, determine any thing; for though he had at an earlier period formed the intention to travel first into Spain, yet, as we have already remarked, he might be induced, by the information respecting the changes in the churches of Lesser Asia, to alter his plan. Nor is it otherwise than natural, that, during his confinement at Rome, he should collect around him younger men, who at other times had been used to serve as companions and fellow-labourers in his ministry, and that he should now make use of them in order to maintain with the distant churches, of whose situation he could receive information through various channels at Rome, a living connection adapted to their necessities.

gave practical proofs of his sympathy,* and through him the apostle learnt how many things which had happened in their church during his absence required to be promptly counteracted.

During the preceding year, a new influence emanating from Judaism had been developed in those regions;—an influence with which Christianity had hitherto not come in contact, but which now threatened to mingle with it, and to endanger its purity and simplicity. It might be expected that Christianity on its first spread among the Jews, would chiefly come in contact with the Pharisaic mode of thinking which was then predominant. Hence the first false teachers, with whom Paul had hitherto been so often in conflict, had attempted a mixture of Pharisaic Judaism with Christianity. But now, after Christianity had spread further among the Jews, and had attracted the attention of those who lived in greater retirement, and troubled themselves little about the novelties of the day, its influence affected sects that had long existed among the Jews of a theosophic-ascetic character, such as that of the Essenes.† Persons of

* It is remarkable that Paul, in the Epistle to Philemon, calls this Epaphras his "*fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus*." As he thus distinguishes him from his other fellow-labourers, we may conclude that it could be affirmed only of Epaphras. Since the judicial inquiry instituted against Paul would have attracted the attention of the Roman magistrates to the new religious party that were opposed to the religion of the state, it may be assumed that this led to the apprehension of Epaphras, who had laboured so zealously on behalf of this cause in Lesser Asia. But it is against this opinion, that he is not mentioned with this epithet in the Epistle to the Colossians, unless we suppose that the apprehension of Epaphras did not occur till after that epistle was written. Still it is fair to suppose, that he was distinguished by this epithet to Philemon only as a faithful companion of the apostle in his confinement; as on the other hand he is distinguished by another epithet in the epistle to the whole church at Colossæ; and this title of honour (*ἡ συνιχνιαλῆτος μου*) is applied in the same epistle to Aristarchus, who had accompanied the apostle in his confinement.

† Storr's opinion that the Jewish-Christian sect at Colos-

such a tendency must have felt themselves attracted, still more than Jews of the common Pharisaical bias, by what Christianity presented that was suited to the internal religious sentiment; only they were too much entangled in their mystical-ascetic bias, so opposite to the free practical spirit of the gospel, and in their spiritual pride, to be able to appropriate the gospel simply and purely with a renunciation of the pre-eminence of a higher religious philosophy, which they fancied themselves to possess, and of a higher practical perfection in their modes of abstinence. They must have been rather tempted to remodel Christianity according

as was derived immediately from the Essenes, who yet can be regarded only as one manifestation of this general mental tendency, is not supported by sufficient evidence. Yet it is not a decisive objection against it, that the Essenes had not spread themselves beyond Palestine, and shewed no inclination for proselytism; for by the influence of Christianity, it is very possible that the original character of such a sect might be somewhat modified. And I would by no means adduce against it, what is said in the Epistle to the Colossians, not merely of the practically ascetic, but also of the theosophic tendency of this sect (their φιλοσοφία), since we cannot trust what Philo says of the Essenes as the ideal of practical philosophers. See my Church History, vol. i. p. 58. But although in this epistle some marks may be found which suit the Essenes, as, for instance, what is said of abstinence, of chastising the body, of the observance of the ceremonial law, of the reverence paid to angels, &c.; yet all this is too general, not to suit many other similar manifestations, arising from the same mental tendency, and on the other hand, we find nothing which marks the whole peculiar character of the Essenes. As a proof how much a propensity to bring themselves with angelology was spread among the Jews, we may notice the words in the κρηγμα Πιστον, in which it is said, "μηδὲ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι δοκίμοι τοῦ θίου γνῶσκου ἐκ πιστευόντων, λατρεύοντες ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀρχαγγέλους." See Clement. Stromata vi. 635. Grabe Spicileg. i. 64. If also an intention was contained in these words to indicate a subordinate place to Judaism as a religious system communicated by angels (the idea which at a later period was formed by the gnostics), the doctrine in vogue among the Jews concerning angels, and their connection with them, might serve as a point of connection for this censure.

to their former ideas and tendencies, and to cast it into a theosophic form of their own. We here see a tendency, first germinating in the circle of Judaism, from which, in the following century, manifold branches proceeded of a gnosticism that corrupted the simple gospel. Paul had probably cause, from his experience during his long sojourn in Lesser Asia, to apprehend the springing up of a tendency so injurious to the gospel, and hence we may account for his warnings addressed to the presbyters of the Ephesian church. His apprehensions were now verified. Jewish false teachers of this tendency had made their way into the church at Colosse. What distinguished them from the common pharisaically-minded Jewish Christians was this,—that they did not begin with recommending to the Gentiles the observance of Jewish ceremonies, as indispensable for justification and sanctification, and for obtaining eternal happiness. Had they proceeded in this manner, they would in all probability not have found an entrance so easily into churches consisting purely of Gentile Christians. But they boasted of the knowledge of a higher wisdom transmitted by tradition among the initiated;* they pretended to a higher knowledge of the spiritual world, to stand in a closer connection with it, and that they could communicate it to those who were disposed to be initiated into their mysteries. With this theoretical tendency they joined a strict ascetism in practice, which was probably in close connection with their theosophic principles, and had its foundation in their notions of matter, as the source and principle of evil; and thus also many particulars in their rules for abstaining from certain things, which it would be injurious to touch or taste, may be referred not simply to the Jewish laws respecting food, but to their peculiar theoretic doctrines.

* Perhaps they used the term *φιλοσοφία*, since this appellation, in consequence of the mixture of Oriental and Grecian ideas at this time, might be used as well as the word *γνῶσις*, afterwards employed among the Jewish theosophic sects to designate their pretended mysteries.

The history of religion acquaints us with a twofold tendency of mysticism; one that adheres to the prevailing cultus, and professes to disclose its higher meaning: another that wears a hostile aspect towards it, and entirely despises what is external and historical in religion. This contrariety had already made its appearance in the Jewish philosophical religion at Alexandria. Among the Jews in that place, a class of religious Idealists had been formed, who, viewing the historical and the literal in religion only as the covering or vehicle of general ideas, drew the inference that the attainment of perfection depended on holding fast those ideas, while all besides was abandoned to the childish multitude who were incapable of higher conceptions, and satisfied with the outward husk of sensible objects.* Philo, in whom we have an example of the first tendency, combats, although agreeing with them in the principles of allegorical interpretation, those despisers of the letter; while he taught that it was possible only by spiritual intuition to penetrate into the true internal meaning of religion, and to know those mysteries of which outward Judaism presented the symbols. But he also taught, that in proportion to the conscientious reverence with which the external was contemplated, would be the progress through divine illumination in the examination of the internal. This last tendency we must suppose to exist in the sect of which we are now speaking.

In however slight a degree a party of common Judaizers would have been dangerous to the church at Colossæ, yet Judaism under this modification would be far more dangerous for many. For the people of that age who were filled with anxiety for a communication with Heaven, and for the investigation of the invisible, stretching beyond the limits of earthly existence, the promise of

* Thus characterized by Philo: "οἱ τοὺς ῥητοὺς νομοὺς συμβαλὼν τῶν πρᾶγματων ὑπελαμβάνοντες, τα μὲν ἄγαν ἀκριβοῦσαν, τῶν δὲ ῥαθυμῶν ἀλιγνοῦσαν." See his work, *De Migratione Abrahami*, p. 16.

a higher knowledge that to a certain extent would release them from the thralldom of the senses, was very seducing. Such anxious inquiries had led many an individual to Christianity, which, while it brought them to a consciousness of the real wants of their religious and moral nature, for which it guaranteed the relief, communicated on this side another tendency to their minds; but before it had thoroughly penetrated their life and thoughts, it might easily happen that such illusions, falling in with a previous and only partially conquered tendency, would deceive them by the dazzling appearance of something higher than what was offered them in the simple and ever practical doctrine of the apostles. Moreover, in a country like Phrygia, where a propensity for the mystical and magical was always rife, as was evident from the forms of religion peculiar to the country, the worship of Cybele, and afterwards Montanism,* such a tendency would be peculiarly dangerous to Christianity.

Paul describes the higher philosophy of religion of which these people boasted, as the following of human traditions,† as a cleaving to the elements‡ of the world, and not proceeding from Christ. He objects to the preachers of this doctrine, that they did not adhere to Christ as the head. From this it has been incorrectly inferred by many, that these persons were in no sense Christians. But the main point in Paul's disapproval of

* Compare Böhmer's *Isagoge* in *Epistolam ad Coloss.*, p. 9.

† Not proceeding from what the Spirit of God had revealed.

‡ The στοιχία τοῦ κόσμου, in Col. ii. 8, and other passages, are not to be understood, it appears to me, as is commonly explained of the *rudimenta religionis*, both in Judaism and Heathenism; but a comparison of all the Pauline passages, and the Pauline association of ideas, seems to favour our understanding the phrase of the elements of the world in a peculiar sense, as denoting the earthly, elsewhere termed τὰ σωματικά. Hence ii. 20, στοιχίῳ τοῦ κόσμου and κόσμος may be considered as synonymous.

them is this, that their doctrine, although connected with Christianity, was in contradiction to its spirit and nature,—that although they acknowledged Jesus as the Christ, and therefore as their Lord and Head, yet the spirit and tendency of their doctrine were at variance with this acknowledgment, since they did not, in accordance with it, set out from their relation to him in their striving after a knowledge of divine things, and make Him their central point. In fact, it is only on the supposition that they professed to attach themselves to the Christian faith, that this disapproval retains its full significance.

It would indeed be possible so to explain the relation of these persons to Christianity,* that they did not come forward in direct hostility against it, but yet ascribed it only a subordinate importance in their religious development—that they acknowledged Christ only as the prophet of the heathen world, which hitherto had known nothing of the true God, and attributed to the religion revealed by him only a subordinate value for the religious culture of the heathen.† They perhaps taught that by their

* This view has been recently developed with much skill and acuteness by Dr Schneckenburger, in his work on the Baptism of Proselytes. See also his *Beitrage zur Einleitung in's Neue Testament*, p. 146.

† Among the Jewish theologians, there were those who had borrowed from the Platonic philosophy the doctrine of the constellations, as *Στοι αστρον*; and accordingly explained the passage in Deut. iv. 19, as meaning that God had left the adoration of the heavenly bodies as a subordinate religious standing-point to other nations, but had revealed himself only to the Jews. This view might afterwards be further modified, that God had given the Logos or Jesus to the heathen as their teacher and governor, but that the knowledge and worship of the Supreme God was only to be found among the Jews. Since Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, in what he represents these Jewish theologians as saying, has put into Trypho's mouth what they were at that time in the habit of saying, we may consider him as expressing their views, when he brings in Trypho as saying; “*Ἰστω ὑμῶν ἐξ εἰδῶν κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ γνωριζόμενος, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ σημαίνουσιν, εἰτινες καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνομήματος αὐτοῦ χριστιανοὶ καλεῖσθαι πάντες ἐσχηκότες ἡμῖς δι*

connection with the hidden supreme God which was effected through Judaism, they were raised above the revelations of the Mediator, the Logos, and thus above Christianity, and thereby obtained the power to employ higher spirits themselves in their service.* According to this view, we may suppose that these persons, from the standing-point of a pretended spiritual conception of Judaism, had formed the same judgment respecting the subordinate standing-point of Christianity, as many of the later gnostics from the standing-point of a spiritualised Christianity were accustomed to pass on Judaism as the religion of the Demiurgos.

But although such a conception of the peculiarities of

τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦτοι κρησαντες λατρευομεν οὐτως, ἐν διαμεθεῖ της ομολογίας αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐκ τῆς προσκυνησεως.^h The doctrine of the Clementines also may be here compared. According to this work, Christianity contained in a form of revelation designed for heathens, the same as original Judaism purified from foreign admixtures, so that he who adhered to Jesus alone, as well as he who adhered to Moses alone, could attain to a participation of the kingdom of God, provided the latter did not transgress by blaspheming Christ, and the former by blaspheming Moses. If a Jew, with a greater partiality for Judaism, contemplated Christianity, yet the same fundamental principle could easily be so modified, that genuine Judaism would appear more valuable than that form of revelation which was specially intended for the Gentiles.

* This idea was always to be found among the gnostics of the second century, and meets us in the Indian religious systems, and in Buddhism, that men, by communion with the Supreme original being, obtained power to make use of inferior spirits for their own ends, and that in this manner wonderful things could be accomplished by their aid. Here the contrast which Philo makes between the *ἰσῆς τοῦ λόγου* and the *δυνάεις τοῦ ἵστος* may be applied, only modified, otherwise than in Philo; for the Alexandrian theologians of Philo's school attached no importance to the connection with angels, since they comprised every thing in the contact of the spirit with God himself, and the contemplation of ideas. In the sect here spoken of, the oriental-theosophic rather than the Grecian-philosophic element of Philo's theology is prominent.

this sect is possible, yet it is by no means sufficiently supported by the marks which are deducible from Paul's argumentation. Had they sought actually to seduce from Christianity those among whom they found entrance, Paul would have marked this much more strongly. His reasonings indeed, as they are carried on in this epistle, would apply to those persons who, though engaged in no immediate and open opposition to Christianity, yet assigned to it a subordinate place;* but the peculiar manner in which he argues by no means justifies us in concluding that they are the direct object of his censure. Since he reproves these persons for their reverence of angels, it follows that they placed themselves in a subordinate relation to angels, and hence certainly to the Logos, a being exalted above all angels (the ἀρχαγγέλους). Had they maintained that by an immediate connection with the hidden God, they could exalt themselves above the Logos and his revelation, Paul would without doubt have expressed, in direct opposition to this doctrine, the fundamental principle, that men can enter into connection with the Father only through the Logos. He makes use, it is true, of this principle, but in reference to a different object of debate.

In that Judaizing sect which here came into conflict with the simple apostolic doctrine, we see the germ of the Judaizing gnosticism. Though the account given by Epiphanius of the conflict between Cerinthus and the apostle Paul is not worthy of credit, yet at least between the tendency which Paul here combats and the tendency of Cerinthus the greatest agreement is found to exist, and, judging by internal marks, we may consider the sect here spoken of to be allied to the Cerinthian. It is remarkable that, to a late period, traces of such a Judaizing angelological tendency were to be found in those parts, for at the council of Laodicea canons were framed against a Judaizing observance of the Sabbath, and a

* Schneckenburger has developed this view in his late essay on this subject.

May no one succeed in beguiling you in reference to your highest interests (merely because it so pleases him—for his own arbitrary pleasure), by the appearance of a humility put on for show, by the worship of angels, since he is disposed to pry into what is hidden from man*—for such a one, with all his appearance of humility and a spiritual life, is puffed up with an ungodly mind, which places its confidence in a nullity; he can neither exalt himself above the world nor to Christ, for he does not hold fast the head from which alone the body, animated by it and held together by its influence in all its members, can develop itself for the end designed by God. How is it, if ye are dead with Christ to the things of the world, that ye can adopt as if ye belonged to the world, such maxims as, Touch not this, taste not that; since all this, according to the doctrine of these persons, will only by the use tend to destruction! Which doc-

* In the passage, Col. ii. 18, that reading which omits the $\mu\eta$ has much in its favour, the authority of the most important manuscripts, and the comparison with the other reading $\kappa\alpha\iota$, which may be considered as a similar gloss. It is also more easy to explain how the connection of the whole verse might occasion the interpolation of the negative, than how it should occasion its rejection, by which it is only made more difficult. If this reading be adopted, we must understand the passage thus: "He pries into which (as he imagines) he has seen, the appearances of angels—puffed up by the delusive images, which are only a reflection of the sensuality that prevails over him, of his sensual earthly tendency to which he drags down the objects of religion, the Invisible." And in this case the contrast would be very suitable; he adheres not in faith to the *invisible* Head. But yet this reading appears to me to have the connection and the meaning of single words too much against it for me to admit it. The $\kappa\alpha\iota$ appears to me too plainly to designate an impertinent eagerness to pry into what is hidden from human sight, and to presuppose the negative $\mu\eta$; and if the apostle had wished to mark supposed appearances of angels, he would certainly not have used $\kappa\alpha\iota$ without some further limitation, some additional phrase, with which the following $\kappa\alpha\iota$ might be connected; as, for example, by a $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$, this vision would have been marked as deceptive and presumptuous.

trines certainly have an appearance of wisdom in the arbitrarily invented worship of God, the show of humility, and the chastening of the body; but yet things which have no real value, and only serve to gratify an ungodly mind. If, therefore, ye are risen with Christ, seek after that which is above: let your thoughts be directed thither where Christ is, who is exalted to the right hand of God: let your wishes be fixed on heaven." This tendency towards heaven, this life rooted in God, was always set in opposition by Paul to the superstition that would drag down divine knowledge to the objects of sense.

This epistle was conveyed to the church at Colossæ by Tychicus, one of the missionary assistants of Paul, who was returning to Lesser Asia, his native country. But since Paul could not furnish him with epistles for all the Asiatic churches, and yet would gladly have testified his lively interest in all, and wished, as the apostle of the Gentiles, to address a word to all collectively, he prepared a circular letter designed for all the churches in that region. In this epistle, in which the apostle of the Gentiles addressed himself to all Gentile Christians as such, he treats only of one great subject of general interest, the actual efficiency of the gospel among the Gentiles, without entering upon other topics.* The similarity of the two epistles (the Epistle to the Colossians and the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians) is of such a kind, that we see in it the work of the same author, and not an imitation by another hand. Let us remember that Paul, when he wrote this epistle, was still full of those thoughts and contemplations which occupied his mind when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians; thus we can account for those points of resemblance in the second, which was written immediately after the first. And hence it also is evident, that of these two, the Epistle to the Colossians was written first, for the apostle's thoughts there exhibit themselves in their original formation and connection, as they were called forth by his

* It was so far a happy thought of Schulz to describe this Epistle as a companion to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

opposition to that sect whose sentiments and practices he combats in that epistle.*

Though this epistle has come down to us in the manuscripts, now extant, as addressed to the church at Ephesus, yet the general character of the contents, suited to the wants of the Asiatic Christians of Gentile descent, testifies, by the absence of all special references to the peculiar circumstances of the Ephesian church, against such an exclusive or predominant appropriation of it. If this epistle had been designed principally for the Ephesian church, Paul would certainly have been impelled to say to those among whom he had spent so long a time, many things relating solely to their peculiar circumstances. This conclusion, which we draw with certainty from the contents of the epistle, is confirmed by the information that has come down to us from antiquity, that the designation of the place in the introductory salutation is wanting in ancient manuscripts. But since the Ephesian church consisted for the most part of Gentile Christians, we have no reason to doubt that this epistle was equally designed for them, though being a circular letter, the apostle touched only on those circumstances and wants which were common to them with the other churches of this district. It might also be thought most proper, that the epistle should be sent from Ephesus, as the metropolis and the seat of the mother-church, to the other churches. This would best agree with the designation which it generally obtained at an early period, as specially addressed to the Ephesian church. Yet from this remark we do not venture to infer too much, since the great preponderance of the Ephesian church, as one of the *sedes apostolicæ*, although

* For the confirmation of this relation of the two epistles to one another, the *καὶ* in Eph. vi. 21 certainly serves, which can only be explained by supposing that Paul had in his thoughts what he had been writing to the Colossians, iv. 8, according to the correct reading *ἐν γὰρ αὐτῇ*. Harless has noticed this mark in the introduction to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, and after him Wiggers jun. in the *Studien und Kritiken*; 1841, 2d part, p. 453.

the epistle at first might have had no precise designation, must have procured a predominant value to its name, as if of one directed to the Ephesian church.*

In the second period of his confinement, Paul received a contribution from the church at Philippi (who had already given practical proof of their love for him) through Epaphroditus, their messenger, from whom also he received an account of their state. In consequence of this information, he had occasion to put the Christians at Philippi on their guard against the influence of Judaizing teachers, to exhort them to union among themselves, and to recommend to those who had more liberal and enlarged views, forbearance towards their weaker brethren. On this last topic, he gives them, in the words of the exhortation which he added at the close of the epistle, the important rule, that all should seek to employ faithfully the measure of knowledge which they had already attained (iii. 15), that then God would reveal to them what they still wanted, and thus all would by degrees arrive at a state of Christian maturity.† He exhorted them, under the persecutions to which the Christians in Macedonia were still exposed, to bear joyfully their sufferings for Christ's sake, and to view them as a gift of grace, which was vouchsafed to them.

* The well-founded reaction against the negative assertions of an arbitrary scepticism, must not seduce us into a superstitious overvaluation of tradition, which in its turn may lead to mere arbitrary assertions, instead of that result which offers itself from the comprehensive survey of Christian antiquity.

† The gloss of the common reading (*καὶ το αὐτο φρονεῖν*), which injures the meaning, arose from mistaking the sense of the passage, and supposing that it referred to Christian unity, and not to the agreement of practice with knowledge.

CHAPTER X.

PAUL'S LABOURS AFTER HIS RELEASE FROM HIS FIRST
CONFINEMENT AT ROME, TO HIS MARTYRDOM.

HITHERTO we have possessed certain information respecting the circumstances and labours of the apostle Paul during his confinement at Rome. But in reference to the sequel, we meet on all sides with great obscurity and uncertainty. The question arises, whether he ended this confinement with martyrdom, or whether he was released from it, and entered afresh on his apostolic labours. The decision of this question depends partly on the depositions of historical witnesses, partly on the result of an examination of Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy, whether this epistle, which was evidently written during a confinement at Rome, must be classed among the epistles written in the time of his first confinement, or whether we must assume the existence of a second. The narratives of the fourth century, according to which Paul was set at liberty and published the gospel in Spain, cannot be taken into account, for all these might very easily arise from what he says in his Epistle to the Romans, of his intentions of visiting Spain. But more attention is due to an account which is given by a man who was in part a contemporary, and probably a disciple of Paul. Clement, the bishop of Rome, says expressly in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, (§ 5)* that Paul

* What we learn from the only natural interpretation of this passage could not have occurred, if what Schenkel has remarked in his dissertation against a second confinement of Paul (in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1841, part 1), respecting Clement's Epistle be correct; namely, that it was written only a few years after the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, between the years 64 and 65; but we cannot entirely agree with this opinion. The inference from § 41, where the author expresses himself as if the temple and tem-

suffered martyrdom, after he had travelled to the boundaries of the West.* By this expression, we most naturally understand Spain; and though Clement might have understood by it some other place or country than exactly this, yet we cannot in any case suppose, that a person writing at Rome would intend by it that very city.† From this account of Clement, if we must infer

ple-worship at Jerusalem were still in existence, cannot countervail those passages of this epistle which contain the most undeniable marks of a later period; as § 44, on the election to church-offices; § 47, where it is presupposed that Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians at the beginning of the publication (or of *his* publication) of the gospel (ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου). And it appears that the author knew nothing of any epistle written to the Corinthians by Paul before our first epistle to them. I also think that Clement would have expressed himself otherwise in § 5, if he had written only a few years after Paul's martyrdom. The allusions to the Epistle to the Hebrews also indicate a much later date.

* The μαρτυρίῳ is in this connection, “μαρτυρησας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων,” to be understood probably, not in the later meaning of martyrdom, but in the original sense of bearing testimony to the faith, although with a reference to the death of Paul, which was brought on by this confession. “He bore testimony of his faith before the heathen magistrates.” At all events, the words ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων must be understood as a general designation of the heathen magistrates; and we cannot suppose that Clement intended to give a precise chronological mark, or to refer to the persons to whom at that time the management of public affairs was committed in Rome.

† Schrader, indeed, adopts Ernesti's opinion, that by *περὶ τῆς δύσεως* may be meant the boundaries of the west towards the east, and thus nothing else be intended than that Paul had just reached as far as the boundaries of the west. But though we are willing to allow that the words might in themselves be so understood, yet it is impossible so to understand them in this connection. For Clement had just said that Paul proclaimed the gospel in the east and in the west (κηρυξάντων ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει), that he had taught righteousness to the whole world (δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον), and then follow the words ἐπὶ τὸ περὶ τῆς δύσεως ἰλθών. In this connection, Clement must surely have intended to say that Paul advanced far into the west. It may here be remarked,

that Paul carried into effect his intention of travelling into Spain, or that, at least, he went beyond Italy, we are also obliged to admit, that he was released from his confinement at Rome. And we must abide by this opinion, if we have no further information of the circumstances of Paul during his second confinement, if we also place his Second Epistle to Timothy in the time of his first imprisonment.

If we depart from this last supposition, we can put two cases; either that Paul wrote this epistle at the beginning or at the end of his confinement. As to the first case, we know, that Paul came to Rome without Timothy, but that he was afterwards in his society. It may be therefore supposed, that he was called by this epistle from Lesser Asia to Rome, and that from that time he remained constantly with him. But the information furnished by this epistle, of Paul's situation at that time, is entirely opposed to such a supposition. When he wrote it, he had already obtained a public audience, and had been heard in his defence. On the contrary, in the first period of his confinement, this had certainly not happened, since it is first mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians. He then had his martyrdom in prospect, while his First Epistle during his confinement held out the most cheering hopes of his release.

If we take the second case, and consider this epistle

that Clement must have known more of the events in general of Paul's life, for he says that Paul was seven times put in fetters. After what has been said since the publication of this work against this interpretation and application of the passage in Clement, I cannot prevail on myself to give it up; and I am pleased to find critics like Credner, who hold the same views. How can it be imagined that Clement, if he thought only of Paul's first confinement at Rome, could say that he had published the gospel not merely in the east but also in the west, and had come even to the boundaries of the west? Even if we allow much for the rhetorical form of the expression, we cannot consider this as a proper designation of such a fact; and why should a writer who had at hand so many rhetorical designations for the metropolis of the world, have chosen one so unnatural as this?

as the last he wrote in that confinement at Rome, it will connect itself with the Epistle to the Philippians, with respect to the darker prospects of the apostle's situation, of which it contains several indications. But several other things do not agree with this supposition, and rather direct us to another date. And although not every particular which we could mention on this point has equal weight, yet all taken together are in favour of that view, according to which all the particulars can be most naturally and simply understood, in the manner which would first occur to an unprejudiced reader of the epistle. Paul desires Timothy to come to him, without any allusions to his having been already with him during his confinement. When we begin to read the epistle, every thing gives the impression, that he had taken leave of Timothy in the place where the latter was now residing, and since that time had been put in confinement. He cautions him against the false teachers in his neighbourhood (in Lesser Asia, probably at Ephesus) ii. 17, and speaks of them as if he had himself the opportunity of knowing them from personal observation. This could not have been during his earlier residence in Lesser Asia, for at that time these heretical tendencies had not yet shewn themselves, as appears from what we have before remarked; but every thing is easily explained if Paul, being released from confinement, travelled into Lesser Asia, as he intended, and entered into conflict with these false teachers, who had gained a footing there during his absence. He informed Timothy of the result of his first public examination, iv. 16, and in a manner which implies that Timothy knew nothing before of it, and that it had taken place during his absence from Rome. But when Paul made his defence during his first confinement Timothy was with him; (compare Philip. i. 7.) We are therefore led to think of something that happened during Paul's second confinement. There are, besides, many marks which indicate that he had come to the West by his usual route from Lesser Asia through Achaia, but which we know was not his route when he last came from Cæsarea to

Jerusalem. He charges Timothy to bring with him the cloak, the books, and especially the parchments, which he had left behind at the house of a person whose name he mentions. Now it is far more probable, that he left these things behind after a visit to Troas some months before, than at a distance of four or six years, which we must suppose to have been the case, if the epistle was written during his first confinement, and that they should not be brought to him till after so long an interval.* In order to depict his state of desertion, he informs him that Erastus, one of his usual companions, who probably was with him the last time in Lesser Asia,† stayed behind in his native place Corinth; and that he had left another of his companions Trophimus sick at Miletum.‡ Although we find several persons in

* It is an arbitrary assumption that these parchments contained documents relative to his defence, and that for that reason he wished to have them.

† See Acts xix. 22. This could hardly be the same as the *οικονομος* of Corinth, mentioned in Rom. xvi. 23, for his office would scarcely allow of his being so often with Paul on his missionary journeys.

‡ On the supposition that the epistle might have been written during Paul's first confinement, it is the most natural supposition that such persons are here spoken of who had resolved to come to Rome (as Timothy knew), to the apostle's assistance on his trial, according to the usages of Roman law. One of them, Erastus, had not left Corinth as he intended, but remained there. Trophimus (who as a witness might have been of great service) they (the delegates of the churches in Lesser Asia who had agreed to travel together to Rome) had left behind sick at Miletum (*Μιλήτου*, the third person plural). But certainly the other interpretation, in which nothing needs to be supplied, is the simplest, and that which would first occur to an unprejudiced reader of the epistle. Besides, if Paul had reminded Timothy of something which must have been known to him, in order to stir him up still more to set off without delay to Rome, (as Timothy, who was probably staying at Ephesus, must have known that the delegates from the churches had left Trophimus sick in his neighbourhood), he would have added some such word as *ἵνα*, to signify that he was merely reminding him of some-

Paul's society, who were also with him during his first confinement (though this circumstance will not serve to fix the date, since the same causes as at that time might bring them again into his society); yet among these is a Titus, who was not with him before, for we have not met with them together since the apostle's last sojourn in Macedonia and Achaia, and a Crescens, who is not named before as one of his companions.

Against the opinion that this epistle, according to the marks we have indicated, was written in Paul's second confinement, it may indeed be objected, that we find in it no reference to an earlier confinement at Rome. But this will appear less strange, if we attend to the following considerations. By this epistle to Timothy, the apostle by no means intended to give the first information of his new confinement; he rather assumes, that this, and in part the peculiarities of his condition in it, were already known to him, as appears from i. 15,* and by means of the constant intercourse between the chief cities of the Roman Empire, and the lively interest taken by the churches in Paul's affairs, information respecting him must soon have reached Ephesus. Moreover, during this period after his release, so many

thing he knew already. We may also doubt whether the testimony of Trophimus was of so much consequence to Paul. The charge of raising a tumult at Jerusalem would probably not be so dangerous to him; on the contrary, he was most probably justified sufficiently on his arrival at Rome by the statements that were sent at the same time from the Roman authorities, whose inquiries had hitherto led to a favourable result. But *that* charge of having prompted among Roman citizens to apostatize from the state religion, and propagated a *religio nova et illicita*, must have been really dangerous, and in this case Trophimus could be of no assistance to him.

* This passage may be most naturally understood of a number of Christians from Lesser Asia, who, on coming to Rome, were afraid to visit Paul in his confinement, and whom he met with in Lesser Asia when he wrote this epistle. Paul marks the persons to whom he alluded by specifying two of their number.

things occurred in his renewed apostolic labours, which fully occupied the mind of one who was more affected by events relating to the kingdom of God than by any personal considerations, and pushed into the back-ground the recollection of his former confinement; and in the prospect of martyrdom, he would fix his thoughts more on the future than on the past, especially in reference to events that were likely to affect the progress of the kingdom of God on earth.

Now if we admit that Paul was released from that confinement, we must assume that he regained his freedom before the persecution against the Christians occasioned by the conflagration at Rome in the year 64; for had he been a prisoner at this time, he would certainly have not been spared. And it agrees with the chronological data which we have before discovered, that after more than a two years' imprisonment, he regained his freedom between the years 62 and 63, a result of the proceedings against him which in itself, and in connection with existing circumstances, is by no means improbable. The accusation of raising a tumult at Jerusalem had been proved to be unfounded; but the opposition of Christianity to the State-religion had not then attracted public attention, and though this fact could not have passed altogether unnoticed, yet no definite law existed on the subject, and under the Emperor Nero, who ridiculed the established religion, and gave himself little concern about the ancient Roman enactments, such a point might more easily be waved. The friends whom Paul had gained by his behaviour during his confinement, and by the manner of conducting his defence, would probably exert their influence in his favour. Thus he might regain his freedom; and the ancient tradition that he was beheaded* and not crucified like Peter, if true, favours his not having suffered death in the persecution of 64; for had he been put to death in that persecution, so much regard would not have been paid to his Roman citizenship as to spare the hated lead-

* See Eusebius, ii. 25.

er of a detested sect from the more painful and ignominious mode of execution.

From the epistles written by Paul during his first confinement, we learn that he laboured much at Rome in publishing the gospel; his firm advocacy of the cause of God, and his happy release, must have had a beneficial influence in this respect. Hence it came to pass, that Christianity from this time spread with still greater power among the Gentiles in Rome. But owing to the same cause, the new sect, while gaining ground among the heathen to the injury of idolatry, drew on itself the attention of the fanatical people, who could not feel otherwise than hostile to the enemies of their gods; and the hatred thus excited soon occasioned the report to be spread of unnatural crimes committed in the assemblies of these impious persons. Perhaps also the Jews, who were more embittered against the Christians when their designs against Paul proved abortive, contributed their part to excite the popular hatred against them. But a persecution on the part of the state would hardly have been threatened so soon, if the Emperor Nero had not availed himself of the popular feeling, which easily credited every thing bad of the Christians, in order to cast an odium on the Christians which he wished to throw off from himself.* Yet it by no means appears that this outbreak against the Christians in Rome was followed by a general persecution against them throughout the provinces, and hence Paul might meanwhile continue his apostolic labours without molestation in distant parts.

As for the history of his labours in this new field, we have no information respecting it; nor can the total want of sources for this part of church history be at all surprising. But this defect of information cannot be made use of to render doubtful the fact of Paul's second confinement. Nothing, therefore, is left for us, but to compare the short account (already mentioned) in the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, with what Paul himself

* On this persecution in Rome, see my Church History, vol. i. part 1, p. 136; and part 3, p. 239.

tells us respecting his intentions in case he regained his freedom, in the epistles written during his first confinement, and with what may be gathered from his other letters, which it seems probable that he wrote after his release.

Before his confinement, Paul had expressed the intention of going into Spain, and the testimony of the Roman Clement favours this belief that he fulfilled this intention. But during his confinement at Rome he had altered his views, and was determined, by reasons which we have already noticed, to visit once more the scene of his early labours in Lesser Asia. The Second Epistle to Timothy contains hints of his returning by his usual route through Achaia. But it would be possible that after his release he travelled first into Spain; that he there exerted himself in the establishment of Christian churches, and then revisited the former sphere of his ministry; that he was on his return to the West, in order to close there his apostolic commission, but before he could reach his destination was detained and executed at Rome.— However, the want of any memorial of his labours in Spain, the want of any record of an *ecclesia apostolica*, does not favour the supposition that Paul spent any length of time in that country; and hence the other explanation, that he first renewed his labours in the East, then betook himself to Spain, and soon after his arrival was beheaded, seems to deserve the preference.

We, therefore, are of opinion that Paul first fulfilled his intention of returning to Lesser Asia. Now the First Epistle of Paul to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, by the peculiarities of their mode of expression, and the peculiar references to ecclesiastical relations, connect themselves so closely with the Second Epistle to Timothy, and exhibit so many marks of the later apostolic age (one of which we have already noticed), that it appears reasonable to assign both these epistles to this period.

In the earlier history of the apostle, we can find no point of time in which he could have written such a letter to Timothy at Ephesus, in reference to the concerns

of that church, as his first epistle;* for this epistle presupposes a church already for some time in existence,

* The genuineness of the First Epistle to Timothy being presupposed, the view I have here taken of the relations and circumstances under which it was written, appears to be the only tenable one. But I confess that I am not convinced of the genuineness of the First Epistle to Timothy, with the same certainty as of the Pauline origin of all the other Pauline Epistles, and of the two other Pastoral Letters, and the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians. What is said in this epistle of the false teachers excites no suspicion in my mind; and I can find nowhere the allusions to the later gnostic doctrines, which Baur would find in this as well as in the Pastoral Letters. The germ of such Judaizing gnosticism, or of a Judaizing theosophic ascetic tendency, as it shews itself in the two Epistles to Timothy, I would presuppose *a priori* to be existing at this time, since the appearances of the second century point back to such a tendency gradually evolving itself out of Judaism. In this respect, the absence of the marks of a later date in the controversial part of this epistle, is to me a proof of its high antiquity. To the declaration of Hegesippus in Eusebius, iii. 32, that the falsifications of doctrine first began after the death of the apostle, or rather then ventured to make their public appearance, I can attach no such weight as historical evidence, as to cast a doubt on these undeniable facts. As there is an unhistorical tendency produced by a dogmatic bias, which transposes the originators of all heresies to the apostolic age, and makes the apostles to be the first impugnors of them; so also there is a more unhistorical tendency, and equally proceeding from a dogmatic bias (as is the case with all the depositions of Hegesippus), which would maintain that, up to a certain date, the church was wholly pure, and that all heresies broke out first after the decease of the apostles. A common but one-sided truth lies at the bottom of both opinions. I can find nothing surprising in the fact, that, in the two Epistles to Timothy, such an aspect of the present as an omen and germ of what would be developed in the future, is to be seen. The attentive observer, capable of deeper insight, must here behold the future in the present. But I cannot deny that, when I come from reading other Pauline epistles, and especially the two other Pastoral Letters, to this epistle, I feel myself struck by the impression of something not Pauline. More particularly, the mode of transition appears to me not in the Pauline style,—as in ii. 7; iii. 1; iii. 15; v. 17, 18; and the relation of this epistle to the two other Pas-

which, in many respects required a new organization of church relations, the displacing several of the leading officers of the church, and the appointment of others. The new class of false teachers who had sprung up in Lesser Asia during Paul's imprisonment, had acquired great influence in the Ephesian church. As Paul (according to an interpretation not absolutely necessary of his farewell address at Miletus) had anticipated, several overseers of the churches had allowed themselves to be seduced by the spirit of false doctrine. The false teachers to whom we refer bore the same marks which we find in those who appeared in the church at Colossæ during Paul's confinement. They belonged to the class of Judaizers, who maintained the perpetual obligation of the Mosaic law.* But they distinguished themselves from the common Judaizers by a theosophic ascetic tendency. They taught abstinence from certain kinds of food, and prescribed celibacy as essential to Christian perfection.† But they united with this practical tendency a theoretical peculiarity. They prided themselves on possessing a higher *γνῶσις* (the *φιλοσοφία* of the Epistle to the Colossians), and by this they were seduced from the simplicity of the faith. They taught legendary tales respecting the origin and propagation of spirits, like the false teachers at Colossæ.‡ They brought forward subjects

total Letters is also suspicious. I can indeed find reason for allaying these doubts, but none which, taken all together, can satisfy the unprejudiced lover of truth.

* As appears from the Pauline antithesis, 1 Tim. i. 9.

† Among the *σωματικὴ γυμνασία*, 1 Tim. iv. 8, must without doubt be included a devotion that consisted in outward gestures, abstinencies, and ceremonies, the opposite of which is true piety, *νοστίαια*, having its seat in the disposition.

‡ The genealogical investigations common among the Jews, by which they sought to trace their descent from persons of note in former times up to the Patriarchs, cannot certainly be intended in 1 Tim. i. 4, for inquiries of this sort could never be introduced among Gentiles, nor could their minds be so much occupied with them, that an attention to them should be set down among the marks of character. Nor can we suppose a reference to inquiries respecting the genealogy of Jesus; what has just been said would in part apply to this

which gave rise to subtle disputations, instead of leading men to accept in faith the divine means of their salvation; 1 Tim. i. 4. The conflict with this false Gnosis now springing up, must have occupied the churches in these parts. As the prophets in the assemblies of believers frequently warned them of the dangers which from the signs of the times they perceived were threatening the church; so these warning voices spoke also of the conflict that awaited the church with this hostile tendency, which in following ages was one of the severest which the simple gospel had to encounter. These are the express warnings of the Divine Spirit by the inspired addresses in the churches, to which Paul appeals.* To this peculiar state of the church several of the instructions are applicable which Paul gives in this epistle relative to the appointment of their overseers.†

Paul therefore executed his intention of going into Lesser Asia, and found such disturbances in the churches

supposition, and in this case Paul would have marked his meaning more precisely, and according to his usual antithetical style, contrasted the *χριστος κατὰ πνεῦμα* with the *χριστος κατὰ σαρκά*. On the contrary, it will be quite suitable to apply it to the *γενιολογίας τῶν ἀγγέλων*, similar to the later gnostic pneumatologies; on the supposition, indeed, that he wrote of them as already well known to Timothy. Any other person who had forged this epistle, partly for the purpose of employing the authority of Paul against the rising gnosis, would have more exactly marked the object of controversy.

* 1 Tim. iv. 1. A similar expression respecting prophetic intimations occurs in Acts xx. 23.

† From the difference in circumstances would arise the difference of manner in which he expresses himself here and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians respecting a single life. When he wrote to the Corinthians, he opposed those who objected to a single life from the common Jewish standing-point; here he speaks against those who went so far in depreciating marriage as to condemn it altogether as unchristian. In opposition to these persons, who led females to forget altogether the proper destiny of their sex, and to thrust themselves forward as public teachers, Paul says, 1 Tim. ii. 15, that the woman would always be saved in family life (the *ἄν* is to be understood in the sense of—*by means of, in*—as it is often used by Paul), if she lead a holy life in faith and love.

there, arising from the influence of the unevangelical tendency we have noticed, that he held it to be absolutely necessary to remain longer in those parts. He left Ephesus for reasons unknown to us, to visit the churches of Macedonia, but soon returned thither, and in the meanwhile left Timothy behind for the special purpose of counterworking these false teachers, which he considered an object of the first importance; to this he added a subordinate concern, the new organization of the church at Ephesus, and perhaps also the superintendence of some others in the neighbourhood, which had since been formed.*

If we regard the geographical position of the places it agrees very well with Paul's residence in Lesser Asia, and his travelling thence to Macedonia, that at this time he visited the Island of Crete, and there left behind his disciple Titus, to whom he addressed an epistle. It is indeed easy to imagine, that, as Paul had often sojourned for a longer time in those parts, he had already founded several churches in Crete. But besides that, for reasons before mentioned, we are led to fix the date of this epistle nearer that of the two Pastoral Letters, it is also striking that, while Luke in the Acts reports so fully and circumstantially the occurrences of the apostle's last voyage to Rome, and mentions his stay at Crete, he says not a word (contrary to his usual practice in such cases)

* That Paul does not mention in this epistle his deliverance from confinement at Rome, proves nothing against this statement, for a number of events had intervened to occupy his mind, especially when he wrote this epistle. It is indeed surprising that he should charge Timothy to "let no man despise his youth," since Timothy could be no longer a youth. But we must recollect how indefinitely such terms are often used, and that Paul, when he wrote this, might have special reasons for such an injunction; among the leaders of the unevangelical party, there might be persons whose great age had secured for them deference and respect. The passages in Titus ii. 15, and also 2 Tim. ii. 22, (which in that connection has nothing strange), present no fit parallel; and if, in the First Epistle to Timothy, traces can be found of an imitation of the two others, these words may be reckoned among the number.

of the friendly reception given to him by the Christians there, or even of his meeting with them at all. Hence we may conclude that no Christian churches yet existed in the island, though that transient visit would naturally give rise to the intention of planting the gospel there; which he probably fulfilled soon after he was set at liberty, when he came into those parts. As in the last period before his journey to Jerusalem we do not find Titus in his company, and on the other hand we find, in the Second Epistle to Timothy, that he was with the apostle, this agrees very well with the supposition that Paul after his release once more met with him in Lesser Asia, and again took him as his associate in preaching the gospel.

After Paul had laid the foundation of the Christian church in Crete, he left Titus behind to complete the organization of the churches, to confirm the new converts in purity of doctrine, and to counterwork the influence of the false teachers. If we compare the marks of the false teachers in the two other Pastoral Epistles with those in the Epistle to Titus, we shall find a similarity. But if *these* do not induce us to admit—(as we are not authorized to suppose the same appearances of the religious spirit in Crete and in Ephesus)—so neither shall we be led by what can be inferred simply from the epistle itself, to imagine any other object of Paul's opposition and warning than the common Judaizing tendency, and an unspiritual pharisaic study of the Old Testament, disputatious, cleaving to the letter and losing itself in useless hair-splittings and rabbinical fables.*

* As to the genealogies in Titus iii. 9, if we compare this passage with the endless genealogies in 1 Tim. i. 4, we shall be led to understand a reference to a theosophic element, an emanation doctrine; but this expression in the Epistle to Titus, without any thing more definite, and simply in its own connection, favours no such supposition; but we shall be induced to think of the common Jewish genealogies, although we cannot determine precisely for what object these would be employed, and the comparison of 1 Tim. i. 4 with Titus iii. 9, might excite a suspicion of a misunderstood copying in the former.

Paul required of Titus to turn the attention of men to objects altogether different and of practical advantage, deeply to impress on their minds the doctrine which formed the basis of salvation, and to lead them to apply this fundamental truth to real life, and to be zealous to verify their faith by good works.*

When Paul wrote this letter to Titus he had the prospect of spending the winter at Nicopolis, where he wished Titus to join him. As there were so many cities in different parts, which, having been built on the occasion

* All that is said in opposition to this tendency bears the impress of being truly apostolic and Pauline. If the passage in Titus iii. 10 were to be understood in the sense of the later unchristian hatred of heretics, the passage in iii. 2 would be in direct contradiction to it, for in this an exactly opposite disposition is expressed; Christians are here warned of spiritual pride, which might mislead them to exalt themselves as believers and children of God against the heathen, to treat them as enemies, to insult them on account of their superstition and the vices prevalent amongst them. On the contrary, it was their duty to cherish gentleness and kindness towards them, from the consciousness that they, like the heathen, were once the slaves of delusion and of sin, and owed their deliverance from this state, not to their own merits, but to divine grace alone. But the sentiment here expressed, if rightly understood, by no means contradicts the injunction which Paul gives to Titus in iii. 10. In this latter passage, by those who bring in *hæreses* (Gal. v. 20), a class of persons are referred to different from those in the former, such at least who went to greater lengths, separated from Christian fellowship on account of their peculiar opinions, and founded open schisms. Now, Paul advised Titus to enter into no disputations with persons who wished to make these schisms, respecting the peculiarities to which they attached so much importance; but if they were not disposed to listen to repeated admonitions, to avoid all further intercourse with them, since such disputations could be of no advantage, and tended only to injure the hearers, and throw their minds into a state of perplexity. Such persons, whose errors were interwoven with their whole character, were not to be convinced by argument. And as he reprobated their whole mental tendency in reference to religion as unpractical, it followed, of course, that he admonished his disciples not to engage with his adversaries on this standing-point, but if they would not

of some victory, were called Nicopolis, and we have no exact information respecting the travels of the apostle in this last period of his ministry, and the exact dates are wanting, we cannot determine what city is here intended, whether we are to look for it in Cilicia, Macedonia, Thrace, or Epirus. We might suppose that the city built in the last-named country by Augustus to commemorate the sea-fight at Actium was intended; but at all events, it appears from the plan of his journey indicated in the Second Epistle to Timothy, that Paul was come from Lesser Asia into the West, and that he had probably taken farewell of his beloved Timothy at Ephesus.

As soon as he had returned to the West, he fulfilled his purpose of publishing the gospel in Spain. But there he was soon seized and sent as a prisoner to Rome.* After he had been in confinement a long time, and had been subjected to one judicial examination, he wrote his last Epistle to Timothy, whom (as we have just said) he probably had left behind at Ephesus. His situation at this

listen to repeated exhortations to return to evangelical simplicity, they should be left to themselves. In perfect accordance with this injunction, is that which Paul gives Timothy in 2 Tim. ii. 23, to avoid "foolish and unlearned questions," since they only engendered strife, but "with meekness to instruct those that oppose themselves," to try whether they might not be led to repent of their errors, and be brought to an acknowledgment of the truth. Here also, as in the Epistle to Titus, he forbids arguing with these false teachers on their erroneous opinions. It was quite a different thing to point out the right way to those opponents of whose recovery some hopes might be entertained, and to this class the first passage refers.

* It may indeed appear remarkable that Paul, during the last part of Nero's reign, at a time when arbitrary cruelty so predominated, when Christians were so much the object of public hatred, still enjoyed so favourable a situation as a prisoner, so that he could see his friends and write epistles. But the exact situation of prisoners depended so much on accidental circumstances, that we cannot draw certain conclusions respecting it merely from the general state of things. Some Christians might, for ought we can tell, enjoy these privileges even amidst the most violent persecutions.

time was evidently very different from that in which he found himself during his first confinement after his examination. It was *then* universally allowed that he was a prisoner not on account of any moral or political offence, but only for publishing the gospel, and his example gave many courage boldly to confess their faith. But *now* he appeared in his fetters, as an "evil-doer," ii. 9, for all Christians in Rome were considered as *malefici*. Only a few had the courage openly to shew themselves as his friends and companions in the faith. *Then* he was in a state of uncertainty between the expectation of martyrdom and of release, though the latter was more probable. *Now*, on the contrary, he looked forward to martyrdom as the more probable event. He informed Timothy, indeed, that the Lord had granted him power to testify confidently of the faith, and that he would be delivered from the jaws of the lion, from the death that was then threatening him;* still he was far from indulging the hope of being freed absolutely from the danger of death. But this confidence he did enjoy, that the Lord would deliver him from all moral evil,† and preserve him to his heavenly kingdom. As

* The words 2 Tim. iv. 17, may be taken as a figurative expression, to denote generally deliverance from apparently impending death. But it would be also possible to understand them literally, for at that time it would be always possible that Paul, notwithstanding his Roman citizenship, might have reason to apprehend so shameful a death, though he was actually exempted from it.

† After Paul had said, 2 Tim. iii. 17, that the Lord had delivered him from impending death, he expressed the hope that he would still further deliver him. But this it was needful for him more distinctly to define and limit, for he would have said more than, under the circumstances, he was warranted to expect, if he had not added a limiting clause,—namely, that God would deliver him from all moral evil, such as want of fidelity to the gospel, and thus bring him victorious out of all conflicts into his heavenly kingdom; whether he had in his thoughts that participation of the kingdom of heaven, which he hoped to attain by martyrdom, in a fuller communion with Christ and God, or his deliverance to a par-

Paul did not ascribe the power of persisting steadfastly in the confession of the faith even unto death, to himself, but to the power of God, who strengthened him for this purpose ;—he therefore thus expressed himself, that the Lord would uphold him steadfast under all conflicts even until death, preserve him from all unfaithfulness, and thus lead him to blessedness in his kingdom. The apostle's feelings in the prospect of martyrdom are imitably expressed in his last epistle ; his elevated composure, his self-forgetfulness, his tender fatherly care for his disciple Timothy, his concern for the cause of the gospel which he was about to leave exposed to so many attempts to adulterate it, and yet his confidence in the divinity of that cause, and in the almightiness of God watching over it, and conducting its development, a confidence that rose victorious over every doubt.

When he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, and the end of his earthly course was not yet in sight, he said, referring to the defects and infirmities of which he was conscious as a man, that he was far from believing that he had already attained his aim—perfection ; but that he was continually striving after that aim, if he might attain that for which he was called by Christ. Phil. iii. 12. But since he now saw himself actually at the end of his course—since he now looked back on that course with the prospect of approaching martyrdom, and by the power of the Lord had remained faithful under all his conflicts hitherto, and since he was animated by the confident persuasion, that by the same power, he would be brought forth victorious from the con-

ticipation in the perfected kingdom of Christ after his second coming ; as he felt certain, if he were preserved from all evil, of partaking in this kingdom of Christ, whether he lived to that time or died before it came. I will not now attempt to decide between these two modes of interpretation. But one of them must necessarily be taken in connection with what goes before. I cannot allow that these words are a contradiction to 2 Tim. iv. 6-8, nor assent to what Credner, in his *Einleitung*, i. p. 470, founds upon it.

licts that still awaited him,*—at this critical moment, resting alone on the divine promise, all uncertainty vanished from his soul, and he could with assurance say of himself, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness." 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.†

He was far less occupied with thoughts about himself, than with anxiety for the church which he was on the point of leaving in a vehement conflict, both internal and external, but the dangers of the internal conflict were those which gave him the greatest uneasiness. In Lesser Asia, he had been brought into frequent collision with a false Jewish-Christian Gnosis which was spreading in opposition to the simple gospel. He saw in spirit that this false tendency was continually gaining ground, and that, by its arts of deception, it was seducing numbers. Still, he was confident, that its deceptions would at last be exposed, and that the Lord would maintain that gospel which he had entrusted to his ministry, and without him, preserve it pure until the day of his second coming.‡ Since he might assume, that these false teachers were known to Timothy, and had no doubt often conferred with him on the means of counteracting them, he satisfied himself with a general delineation of their character. He mentioned amongst others, those who taught that the resurrection was already past (like the later Gnostics), and who probably explained every thing

* This confidence he also expressed in Philip. i. 20.

† Hence there is no contradiction between the judgment Paul expresses of himself in this epistle and in that to the Philippians.

‡ If we picture to ourselves how Paul was then occupied with the thoughts of death, how uncertain his condition, and under what perplexing relations Timothy found himself in the field of labour where Paul had left him, we cannot deem it very surprising that he should communicate to him these fuller instructions, although he still hoped to see him again in Rome.

which Christ had said respecting the resurrection, of the spiritual awakening by the divine power of the gospel. From this single mark we may conclude, that in general they indulged in a very arbitrary treatment of the historical facts of religion, as far as these did not harmonize with their preconceived opinions.*

We cannot determine with certainty the year in which Paul's martyrdom occurred. We can only place it in one of the last of Nero's reign. And with this supposition, another circumstance agrees. At this time most probably the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by an apostolic man of the Pauline school.† At its conclusion, xiii. 23, we find mention made of the lately obtained release of Timothy, whom we cannot suppose to be any other than the disciple of and companion of Paul. It was Paul's desire that he should come to him, and the zealous sympathy which he evinced had the ef-

* It may be doubted whether Alexander the coppersmith, mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 14, belonged to the number of these false teachers. In this case, he would be the same as the person mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20. It would indeed be possible that this false teacher from Lesser Asia, exasperated at being excluded by Paul from church communion, when he came to Rome, sought to take revenge on the apostle. And the *ἡμέτεροι λόγοι* might then be understood, not of the Christian doctrine generally, but of the pure exposition of the evangelical doctrine as it was given by Paul. But a Gentile or Jew from Lesser Asia might be intended, who violently persecuted Christianity. In this case, he would be distinct from the person mentioned in the First Epistle to Timothy; and it would be on that account by no means clear, that the author of the First Epistle to Timothy was some one else than Paul, who, from a mistake, had made Alexander a false teacher, and had classed him with Hymenæus; for why should not so common a name as Alexander belong to two different persons in Lesser Asia? There is no ground whatever to suppose that this Alexander was the same who is mentioned in Acts xix. 33, for it is far from being evident that he was so violent an enemy of Christianity; the Jews put him forward, not to make complaints against the Christians or Paul, but rather to prevent the rage of the heathens against the enemies of their gods from being turned against themselves.

† See Bleek's Introduction to this epistle, p. 434.

fect of causing him to be apprehended as one of the most active members of the hated sect. If this happened at the time of the Neronian persecution, Timothy would probably have shared the fate of all the Christians at Rome who could then be discovered. But if it happened some years later, it is not improbable that, by the influence of particular circumstances, Timothy obtained his freedom after the martyrdom of Paul.

END OF VOL. I.

EDINBURGH :

PRINTED BY J. GREIG, LAWMARKET.

